

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES. VOL. XXII, No. II. NOVEMBER 1942

SACRIFICIUM QUOD IMMOLAMUS

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS, AS DESCRIBED IN THE MASS ITSELF.

AT the outset of this short liturgical and theological enquiry it is as well, we think, to state that we have no intention to be in any way controversial. We aim solely at presenting a simple and straightforward analysis of that group of prayers, recited privately by the priest after the offertory of the Mass, wherein is set forth the import of the divine act upon which he is engaged. Following the Gelasian Sacramentary, we now call that prayer the Secret (prayer)—*Secreta (Oratio super oblationes secreta)*.¹ In the Gregorian and Ambrosian Sacramentaries it is termed *Super Oblata*. In the Mozarabic Use, as also in the Synaxaries of the Eastern Rites, similar prayers are recited by the priest, usually immediately after the solemn procession at the offertory, offering up to God the gifts brought by the people for the eucharistic sacrifice. In this paper we consider only the Secrets of the Roman Rite as being the most familiar to the readers of these pages; and since most of these readers are priests, no apology is needed for giving the texts in their original Latin, in which tongue the force and cogency of the terminology is more easily grasped and therefore more convincing.

If the theological ruling *Lex orandi statuit legem credendi* can be applied in all theological treatises, surely in the case under consideration it has an overwhelming importance. Historically the Secrets fall into two groups: the ancient and the modern. By far the great majority belong to the former, as may be seen by consulting any edition of the Leonine, Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries.² All know what infinite pains were taken with the renewed redactions of these Sacramentaries, the direct descendant of which is our *Roman Missal*. It is enough to recall the work of Alcuin at the time of the Carolingian revival. As regards the latter group of Secrets, of a more modern, or even recent, composition, their theological accuracy, especially since the time of St. Pius V, is amply guaranteed by the official approval of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, whose members are usually distinguished by a theological equipment of the first order.

Now, most of these prayers have been daily recited for several centuries by the Catholic priesthood of the West, including saints, popes, bishops, doctors, ascetical writers, other major and minor theologians, and, of

¹ Vide *Ord. Roman*, II, P.L., T. 72, col. 973.

² See, for example, the quite accessible edition of the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, by H. A. Wilson, published by the Henry Bradshaw Society, Vol. XLIX, Oxford, 1915.

course, by a host of liturgiologists.¹ Whether consciously, by fervent meditation on the prayers they said, or unconsciously, through their mere daily repetition, these distinguished witnesses of Tradition must have surely imbibed their idea of the Mass largely from the wording of these Secrets. The *lex orandi* must thus have fixed in their minds the traditional *lex credendi* of the Church as to the meaning, import and reality of the Sacrifice of the Mass. It is necessary to bear all this in mind in order to gauge the value of the Secrets as a *locus theologicus* of quite exceptional importance, only surpassed by the testimony of the inspired writings themselves, of which these prayers are the traditional and classical presentment.

Perhaps, to start with, it will help the reader to have set before him in a few alphabetical lists the terms used in the Secrets to describe

(i) the act performed at the Mass; and

(ii) that thing on the altar which is the object of the said act.

Note beforehand that most of the terms are employed indiscriminately in singular or plural, because the celebrant is acting at the altar on behalf of the people as well as in his own name. Note also that each word is invariably qualified in the Secret by the adjective *praesens*, *praesentia*, or by the demonstrative pronoun *hic*, *haec*, *hoc*.

As regards the first point, the act performed at the Mass is described in the following terms:²

Actio;

Commercia; commercia veneranda sacrificii; commercia gloriosa—sacrosancta—sancta—veneranda;

Immolatio;

Mysteria; mysteria haec passionis et mortis Christi (St. Paul of the Cross, 28 ap.); mysteria salutis nostrae; mysteria beata—coelestia—divina—oblata—paschalia—sacra—sacrosancta—tua (i.e. Dei);

Mysterium; mysterium oblatum Redemptionis aeternae; mysterium mirabile; mysterium tantum; virtus mysterii;

Oblatio; oblatio consecranda—gloriosa—immolanda—immolata—munda—mystica—sacra; oblatio hostiae spiritalis; oblatio nostrae devotionis—nostrae humilitatis—nostrae servitutis; oblatio tuis (Dei) aspectibus immolanda; oblatio munda hostiae spiritalis;

Oblationes; oblationes consecrandae; oblationes hostiarum; oblationes populi tui;

Officia; officia placionis; officia piae placionis;

Operatio; operatio muneris sacri; operatio continua reparationis nostrae (Sat. after Easter);

¹ It is pleasing to find in two of the Secrets a delicate tribute paid by the Liturgy to two of its greatest exponents. The Secret for St. Justin Martyr (Ap. 14), the most ancient writer on the ceremonies of the Mass, says: *Munera nostra . . . benignus suscipe; quorum mirabile mysterium S. Martyr Justinus adversus impiorum calumnias strenue defendit.* That of Blessed Joseph Tommasi (24 March, Of. propria p. al. locis), reads: *Sacramentis tuis attentos nos effice . . . ut ex illis ignem coelestem hauriamus, quo beatus . . . Josephus Maria flagravat, qui divini sacrificii enarravit mysteria.*

² To save space, we give references only for the less known Secrets.

Opus nostrae Redemptionis (IXth Sun. after Pent.);
 Sacrificia; sacrificia dicata—illibata—immaculata—votiva—populi tui—oblata Dei
 conspectibus;
 Sacrificium; sacrificium divinum—incruentum—singulare—salutare; sacrificium propi-
 tiationis; sacrificium *quod immolamus*; sacrificium Deo oblatum; sacrificium hoc
 redemptionis nostrae.

The active celebration or participation of the priest and, in their respec-
 tive order, of the people at Mass is termed :

Attendere rei sacrae;
 Celebrare mysteria Dei;
 Celebrare mysteria Passionis Dominicae (St. Stephen, King of Hungary, 2 Sept.);
 Celebrare sacrificia;
 Celebrare sacrificium;
 Conficere sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis Christi;
 Deferre Deo hostias;
 Deferre Deo hostias immolandas;
 Deferre Deo hostias placationis;
 Deferre Deo pia munera;
 Exercere gloriosa commercia;
 Exercere opus Redemptionis;
 Exhibere hostias sacris altaribus;
 Exhibere sollemniter sacrificium;
 Famulare mysteriis;
 Gerere mysterio Christi Passionem (Wed. in Holy Week);
 Gerere sancta;
 Immolare hostias placationis et laudis;
 Immolare oblationem;
 Immolare sacrificia;
 Immolare sacrificium;
 Immolare sollemniter hostias;
 Inhaerere divinis rebus;
 Innovare super altare Dei aspersionem Sanguinis melius loquentem quam Abel (Feast
 of Precious Blood, 1 July);
 Offerre Deo Agnum immaculatum;
 Offerre Deo Christi Vulnere, nostrae pretia libertatis (Feast of SS. Wounds);
 Offerre Deo hostias—hostias placationis;
 Offerre immolantes charitatis Victimam (i.e. Christum) (St. Francis Regis, 16 June, and
 St. Peter Claver, 9 Sept.);
 Offerre sacrificium—sacrificium laudis;
 Offerre Deo munus sacrificii—munus sacrandum—munus nostrae servitutis—munus
 sacramenti;
 Peragere sacri instituta mysterii;
 Pertractare divina mysteria;
 Reddere Deo debitum nostrae servitutis;
 Reddere Deo sacrificium;
 Recolere rite Passionis memoriam ad altare Dei (St. Gabriel of Our Lady of Sorrows
 27 Feb.);
 Sacrare munera;
 Sacrificare hostiam laudis;
 Servire mysteriis Dei;
 Servire sacramentis coelestibus;
 Tractare divina.

That thing on the altar around which centres the action of the priest
 and the people in their respective sacrificial roles is called :

Divina (neuter plural : divine things) ;

Dona ; dona Ecclesiae ; dona oblata super altare Dei ; dona tua (i.e. Dei) ; dona salutaria ; dona solemnia fidelium ;

Hostia ; hostia immaculata—munda—sacratissima—salutaris—sancta—vivens ; Hostia Filii tui ; hostia gratulationis—oblacionis—placationis—placationis et laudis—unitatis et pacis ; hostia redemptionis humanae ; hostia virgineo fragrans odore (St. Catherine of Siena, 20 April) ;

Hostiae ; hostiae consecrandae—immolandae—pacificae—salutares—sacris alteribus superpositae ;

Libamina : libamina oblata ;

Munera ; munera dicanda—dicata—oblata—offerenda—sacranda—quae sacramus—sacra votiva ; munera plebis tuae ; munus obsequia ;

Munus ; munus oblatum sacrificii ; munus divinum ; munus nostrae servitutis ; munus sacramenti ;

Res divinae ;

Res sacra ;

Sacra (neuter plural) ;

Sacramenta ; sacramenta coelestia ; sacramenta salutis nostrae ;

Sancta (neuter plural) ; sancta quae tractamus.

It is quite obvious that the liturgy has well-nigh exhausted the whole range of sacrificial terms to express, and stress, the reality and completeness of the sacrificial character of the Mass. The words most frequently employed are *immolatio*—*hostia* (victim)—*sacrificium*—*oblatio*—*munera*, the sacrificial import of which is evident. It should be noted, however, that when one carefully analyses in the context the exact meaning of the verbs *immolare*—*offerre*—*sacrificare*, and their correlative nouns, one finds that the nouns and verbs are given an equal value when applied to the eucharistic celebration, viz. that of real, though sacramental, immolation.

We wish to draw particular attention to the words *actio*—*agere*—*agenda*—*facere*—which occur in a few of the most ancient Secrets, for example :

Munera nostrae devotionis . . . suscipe : quae nobis . . . majestati tuae devota offerimus actione (Or. div. 28 : ad post. patientiam).

The classical phrase *actio devota* is tantamount to saying *actio consecratoria* (*actio qua aliquid Deo vovetur, sacratum, sacrificatur, fit sacrum*). Indeed the word *Actio* originally stood simply for *Sacrificium*—Sacrifice. An example still survives in our *Roman Missal*, where the prayers used for the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice proper are said to be recited *infra* (low Latin for *intra*) *Actionem*. The Gelasianum expressed it even more concisely, styling those prayers, which of course include the words of consecration, *Canon Actionis*, that is *Canon Sacrificii*—meaning the authoritative ecclesiastical ruling (Canon) for the celebration of the Mass.¹ It should be remembered that in Hebrew, in Greek and in classical Latin the verb “to do”—*facere*—is convertible with the verb “to sacrifice”. This is very important, since when Christ said to His disciples : *Hoc facite in meam*

¹ Cf. Walafrid Strabo : *Actio dicitur ipse Canon, quia in eo Sacramenta conficiuntur Dominica. De reb. eccles.*, c. 22, P.L., T. 114, col. 950.

commemorationem, He meant: *Hoc sacrificate (hoc sacrificium celebrate) in meam commemorationem*.¹

As there has been in some quarters a certain hesitation in accepting the sacrificial word *immolatio* as literally descriptive of the celebration of the Mass, it will be worth while to quote a few examples from among the rather numerous group of Secrets in which the word is employed. For instance:

Ecclesiae tuae . . . dona propitius intueri: quibus non jam aurum, thus et myrrha profertur, sed quod eisdem muneribus declaratur, *immolatur* et sumitur J. X. Filius tuus, D. noster (Feast of the Epiphany).

Sacrificia . . . paschalibus gaudiis *immolamus*: quibus Ecclesia tua mirabiliter pacatur et nutritur (Wed. in Easter Week).

Pro SS. Martyrum tuorum . . . sanguine venerando, hostias Tibi . . . solemniter *immolamus* . . . : per quem talis perfecta est victoria (Feast, 2 June).

Phrases like *hostias placationis immolamus*, *hostia jugiter imoletur*, *sacrificium cuius Te voluisti immolatione placari*, *sacrificium quod immolamus*, are quite common.²

The essential identity of the Sacrifice of the Mass with the Sacrifice of the Cross is quite clearly, as well as sublimely, expressed in the Secrets, in which, nevertheless, the liturgy never loses sight of the duality of the sacrifices, that of the Cross and that of the Christian altar, each complete in itself as regards the mode of immolation unbloody in the latter, bloody in the former. As Abbot Vonier puts it, "Out of the abundance of the great thought of the Cross the Eucharist springs".³ The Sacrifice of the

¹ At one time the whole Mass was designated *Actio* or *Agenda*. The Cluniac Benedictine Dom Claude de Vert writes: "Le Canon est aussi appelé *Action*. Nom autrefois commun à toute la Messe, que Saint Augustin appelle *Ordinem agendi* et le Concile de Carthage II *agendam*. Et cela parceque le mot *agere* ou *facere* se prend souvent dans les anciens Auteurs Ecclesiastiques et Prophanes, pour sacrifier; faire une victime, pour dire, l'offrir en sacrifice. *Cum faciam vitula pro frugibus ipse venio*, dit Virgile (Eglog. 1). *Facere unum pro peccato et alterum in holocaustum*: immoler l'un pour le péché et offrir l'autre en holocauste (Levit. xv). *Facietis bircum pro peccato*: Vous offrirez un buc pour le péché. On voit aussi dans l'Evangile, *Facere Pascha*, pour *immolare Pascha*, *comedere Pascha*." (*Explication . . . des cérémonies de l'Eglise*, Paris, 1713, Tom. IV, p. 183.) Cardinal Bona cites other examples from the Latin Classics (*Rerum Liturgicarum* . . . ed. Sala, Turin, 1747, T.I., pp. 23-5; T. III, pp. 243 sqq.). In recent times Father C. Lattey, S.J., has gathered twenty-six examples from the Old Testament, in which the Hebrew and the Greek "To do" is rendered in the Vulgate simply by "To sacrifice". (See *St. Paul and his Teaching*, 1930, pp. 97-101.)

² See other examples: IIIrd Sun. in Advent; Feasts of St. Gregory the Great, 12 Mar.; of O.L. Help of Christians, 24 May; of St. Anthony, 13 June; of St. Francis Regis, 16 June; of St. Peter Claver, 9 Sept.; of SS. Chrysantus and Daria, 25 Oct.; etc.

³ *Sketches and Studies in Theology*, 1940, p. 65. Abbot Vonier came to the conclusions which we have stated above by studying the pre-Tridentine writers and the Tridentine decrees on the Sacrifice of the Mass. See his essays, *Concepts of Commemoration and Immolation* and *Eucharistic Theology*; in *Sketches*, pp. 62-89, and *Christianus Sacrificans in Christianus*, 2nd ed., 1934, pp. 57-75; and, of course, his *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, 1925, *passim*. For the traditional doctrine on the Sacrifice of the Mass the present writer is also indebted to the excellent *Praelectiones de Eucharistia* in typescript, of his old professor of theology, Dom Hartman Strohsacker, at one time Rector of San Anselmo on the Aventine, Rome, afterwards abbot of Göttweig in Austria and now detained in a Nazi concentration camp.

Mass is the self-same Sacrifice of the Cross, rendered present again (*repraesentatum*), re-enacted on our altars in a sacramental, but no less real, fashion. The following Secrets bear out these theological truths. The first here quoted may be described as a theological *locus classicus*, for St. Thomas brings it forward to prove that "Christ is truly sacrificed (*immolatus*)" at Mass.¹ It is this :

Concede nobis . . . haec digne frequentare mysteria : quia quoties hujus hostiae commemoratio celebratur, opus nostrae redemptionis exercetur (IXth Sun. after Pent.).

Compare the above Secret with the following :

Fac nos . . . his muneribus offerendis convenienter aptari : quibus ipsius venerabilis Sacramenti celebramus exordium (Ash Wed.).

Suscipe sacrificium, cujus te voluisti dignanter immolatione placari (Sat. after Ash Wed.).

. . . quod Passionis Filii tui Domini nostri mysterio gerimus . . . (Wed. in Holy Week).

Concede . . . semper nos per haec mysteria paschalia gratulari, ut continua nostrae Reparationis operatio perpetuae nobis fiat causa laetitiae (Sat. in Easter Week).

Respice quas offerimus hostias . . . ut qui Passionis Dominicae mysteria celebramus, imitemur quod agimus (St. Stephen of Hungary, 2 Sept.).

Suscipe . . . hostiam Redemptionis humanae (St. Cuthbert, 20 Mar., inter of, pr.).²

On Maundy Thursday the Secret refers to the first Eucharistic Sacrifice, also complete in itself, which Our Lord celebrated at the Last Supper :

Ipse Tibi . . . sacrificium nostrum reddat acceptum, qui discipulis suis in sui commemorationem hoc fieri hodierna traditione monstravit.

Finally, there is the beautiful Secret referring to Christ as the Prince of Martyrs and to the Cross as the source of all martyrdom :

In tuorum . . . pretiosa morte justorum sacrificium illud offerimus, de quo martyrium omne sumpsit principium (Thursday, 3rd Week in Lent : SS. Cosmas and Damian).

The fourfold object—latreutic, eucharistic, impetratory, propitiatory—of the Sacrifice of the Mass, as well as its manifold effects in the supernatural life of the soul, together with the real sacramental presence of Christ, are expressed in the Secrets in a hundred different ways.

The Eucharist is the *Hostia laudis*, *Hostia placationis*, *Sacrificium ad honorem nominis Dei deferendum*. Again, it is the *Fons omnis sanctitatis* ; bestows upon our souls *illud quod divinum est* ; makes us *participes unius summae divinitatis* ; acquires for us both the *gratiam piae devotionis* and the *effectum beatae perennitatis* ; applies to our souls the *effectum redemptionis (Christi)*. It is the royal banquet, where we eat the *divinam carnem, qua nutriamur et sanctificemur*. We approach the altar *Corpore et Sanguine Christi saginandi* ; through our

¹ *Summa*, III, q. 83, a. 1, c.

² Similar, and perhaps even more expressive, Secrets, may be found among those of more recent composition. For example : St. Paul of the Cross, 28 April ; St. Camillus de Lellis, 18 July (illud D.N.J.X. immensae charitatis opus renovamus) ; proper Masses in honour of the Holy Redeemer, of the SS. Wounds, of the Passion (haec oblatio . . . quae in ara crucis . . .), of the Spear and Nails (hoc sacrificium vespertinum, quod Filius tuus in cruce obtulit), etc.

sacrificial offering we, in our turn, are made a *munus aeternum* unto God: we are promised thereby the *gratia in praesenti* and the *gloria in futuro*; thereby also our names *beatae praedestinationis liber adscripta retinet*. The Eucharist *nos emundat, renovat, gubernat, protegit, vivificat, munit, ab hostibus tuetur, actione in nobis permanet, nutantia corda nostra dirigit*. We even pray God, through It: *Ad Te etiam nostras rebelles compelle propitius voluntates*; the Church finally finds therein the unspeakable gifts of peace and union:

Ecclesiae tuae . . . unitatis et pacis propitius dona concede; quae sub oblatiis muneribus mystice designantur.

However, it is to the Postcommunions rather than to the Secrets that we would refer our readers for a full enumeration of the effects of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Such is the traditional belief in the Sacrifice of the Mass. The Fathers of Trent couched it in words which retain all the value and significance of that centuries-old tradition. The second General of the Society of Jesus, Father Diego Lainez, certainly one of the ablest of the Trent theologians, whom St. Pius V., O.P., styled "the best lance for the defence of Holy Church", when presenting his *Votum* on the Eucharistic Sacrifice on 27 August and 6 September, 1562, defined the Sacrifice of the Last Supper, the Sacrifice of the Cross, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, each by itself and in its own way, as a *verum et plenum sacrificium*.¹ He was merely echoing the traditional Catholic doctrine as expressed particularly in the Secrets of the Mass.

ROMANUS RIOS, O.S.B.

THE REVIVAL OF A DOCTRINE

ONE of the outstanding features of Catholic theological literature in recent years has been the number of books on the Doctrine of the Mystical Body. This is all the more remarkable because the Mystical Body is not a doctrine in the ordinary sense of the term, that is, it embodies no separate and distinct truth of faith such as we find enumerated in the Apostles' Creed. If we open a manual of Dogmatic Theology, we find treatises on the Church, the Sacraments, the Incarnation, the Mystery of the Trinity, but we look in vain for a treatise on the Mystical Body of Christ. For want of another word we call it a doctrine, but it is rather a magnificent synthesis of all Catholic doctrine. It is not so much an indi-

¹ See Theiner, *Acta Concilii Tridentini*, II, p. 95; also H. Grisar, S.J., *Jacobi Lainez . . . disputationes Tridentinae* . . . , Innsbruck, 1886, Vol. II, pp. 212-14; Martinez de Azagra, *El Padre Diego Lainez*, Madrid, 1933, pp. 313-14; Manuel Alonso, S.J., *El Sacrificio Eucaristico de la Ultima Cena del Señor según el Concilio Tridentino*, particularly pp. 96, 179, 202, 245, *sed passim*.

vidual dogma as a special point of view which embraces every dogma, enlarging the scope of each, deepening and widening its significance, revealing hidden riches and wondrous workings of God's grace and wisdom. Each separate truth, thus linked with all the rest, acquires fresh meaning and a new beauty, like a note of music caught up into some lovely melody or grand harmonious chord.

The difference between the doctrine of the Mystical Body and the other doctrines of faith is suggested by its very name. The Incarnate Word, the Trinity, the Church, the Holy Eucharist, are all concrete terms, whereas the Mystical Body is obviously metaphorical; taken literally, the expression would be a contradiction in terms, for "mystical" here means "spiritual", while a body is essentially material. It is, then, an elaborate comparison, an inspired metaphor which flashed from the genius of St. Paul as he wrote under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Apostle of the Gentiles was no literary dilettante or professional man of letters; all his Epistles were written with the purely practical aim of instructing those whom he had just won to Christianity, and he had neither time nor inclination to be a stylist. Yet no writer has ever struggled with words as he did, or suffered more from the limitations of human language. In vain he coined words, in vain he heaped phrase upon broken phrase until even St. Peter had to confess that in the Epistles there were "certain things hard to be understood"; no tongue ever spoken by men was adequate to express the divine realities of the New Dispensation, to compass "the breadth, and length, and height, and depth" of God's designs, or convey any but the coldest and weakest impression of "the charity of Christ, which surpasseth all knowledge".

But an image can often render what cannot be expressed in words. It must have been for St. Paul a moment of supreme ecstasy when, striving to make clear all that Christ meant to those united to Him by faith and love, the life that flowed from Him into their souls, the intimate union with Him and with each other, the marvellous unity of His Church despite manifold differences of race, character, social position and function in those who belonged to it—when he saw all this summed up in one daring metaphor. It was a figure of speech so bold that it must have startled even St. Paul himself, yet so true that it could only have come from the Author of all truth; it was perfect in its application, and so replete with meaning that volumes would not have sufficed to develop fully its tremendous import: "For as the body is one, and hath many members; and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body; so also is Christ . . . you are the body of Christ, and members of member" (I Cor. xi, 12, 27).

The phrase first occurs in the Epistle to the Romans, and St. Paul returns to it again and again in his later Epistles. At first he uses it only as an inducement to mutual union and charity, but we can see how completely the idea had gripped his imagination, for he is constantly developing the comparison and finding fresh applications of it. In I Cor. it becomes a

telling argument in favour of chastity, while the unity of the members is at once symbolized and assured by the common table where they partake of the Holy Eucharist: "One body, one bread, all that partake of one bread." Finally, in the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, his thought seems to reach its full maturity. Here we have mention not only of the Body, but of the Head, Who is Christ: "God . . . hath made Him head over all the Church, which is His Body, and the fullness of Him Who is filled all in all." This brings us to the question of the mutual relations of Head and Body, and in a magnificent passage he describes the gradual growth of the Church under the influence of the grace of Christ: "That doing the truth in charity, we may in all things grow up in Him Who is the Head, even Christ: from whom the whole Body, being compacted and fitly joined together, by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the Body unto the edifying of itself in charity." In astonishingly material terms he insists once again on the close union which exists between Christ and His members: "We are members of His Body, of His flesh and of His bones," and he even finds a parallel between the union of Christ and the Church and that of husband and wife, who are two in one flesh.

The early Fathers made full use of this doctrine of the Mystical Body. Allusions to it, with numerous practical applications and magnificent developments, constantly recur in their writings, and especially in those of St. Augustine and St. John Chrysostom. But as time went on, such references became less frequent, a fact which is perhaps best explained by the peculiar circumstances under which Christian doctrine developed. Each dogma, attacked in turn by heretics, had to be defended by a process of profound analysis, and the dividing line between orthodoxy and heresy fixed for ever by means of exact definitions. It was inevitable that in this deliberate narrowing of the scope of theological thought the more general aspects of divine truth should for a time recede into the background. The microscope is a necessary instrument of scientific investigation, but its field of vision is extremely limited; or, to use a more apt illustration, a man who fixes his gaze on one particular feature of a landscape perceives more of its details, but is less aware of the view as a whole.

Today the principal dogmas of our faith have all reached an ample development, and Catholic theology and philosophy stand together as the noblest intellectual achievement of man. The process is not yet complete, nor will it ever be here below, for it is only in the light of eternity that the obscurities of faith will finally vanish and the divine plan be manifested in all its beauty and grandeur. Our present knowledge is necessarily limited and incomplete: "For we know in part, and prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away. . . . We see now through a glass in a dark manner: but then face to face." With this we must be content "until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in our hearts". (II Pet. i, 19.)

We do not know where the development of Christian doctrine will stop, and it is at least possible that it will not go much further. The renewed attention given of late to the doctrine of the Mystical Body may indicate that the whole trend of Catholic theology is altering, that while speculation and definition may still continue to some extent to shed light on many an obscurity, our minds are gradually being brought back to the contemplation of our faith as a whole. If so, a thought suggests itself which at first sight appears "a wild surmise", and yet is not entirely without foundation—are we near the end of the world? It might seem that only by the greatest stretch of imagination we can connect this idea with the doctrine of the Mystical Body, but at the same time we can safely say that the development of Revelation is intimately bound up with the history of the world. The Church has a double function—to save the souls of men by offering them the means of grace, and to teach them, in Our Lord's words to His Apostles, "all things whatsoever I have commanded you". We know that the duration of time will be determined by the number of souls to be saved; when the Mystical Body of Christ is complete, the angel will sound the trumpet and announce that time is no more. Is it extravagant to suppose that the outpouring of grace and the development of truth will go hand in hand throughout the ages, since the Church is the Body of Him Who is "the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth"? If this be so, then we may lawfully draw from the development of truth some inference with regard to the end of the world. The Body, like the Head, will "advance in wisdom and age, and grace with God and men". It may well be that this "wisdom" is nearing its fullness, for in Christian doctrine it would seem that synthesis is now taking the place of analysis, that after showing us in detail the beauties of each separate dogma, the Holy Spirit is now inviting us to view the whole truth, as far as it is to be revealed here below, in the splendid image of the Church as the Body of Christ. The wheel has come full circle, and we are returning to that early vision which entranced St. Paul and embraces in its vast simplicity the many wonders of God's design for man's redemption.

But these are mere speculations, however interesting they may be. Of the end of the world there is only one thing certain—"of that day and hour no one knoweth, no not the Angels of heaven, but the Father alone"; and, besides, it is not so much the end of the world that should concern us as the manner of our own short sojourn in it. There are more practical thoughts suggested by the doctrine of the Mystical Body. In the first place, the focusing of our attention on this doctrine is no chance occurrence. Every manifestation of truth in the Church is the work of the Holy Ghost, and He chooses the time and the manner of such manifestation. If in our own day theologians and spiritual writers have devoted so much thought to the elaborating of this doctrine, it is because the Holy Spirit has moved them to do so. Now, doctrine and devotion are inseparably linked together, and the many devotions which have sprung like flowers from the

fertile soil of divine truth are also the work of the Spirit of Truth, Who is the Sanctifier, seeking by every means to develop the life of grace in souls. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that the doctrine of the Mystical Body is peculiarly adapted to the needs and to the mentality of our times, and is the divinely ordained stimulus which will inspire a deeper spiritual life and more fervent devotion in men today, just as, a generation ago, devotion to the Sacred Heart came to revive the dying flame of divine love in a world where charity had grown cold, to quote the words of Pope Pius XI.

The conclusion is obvious. If this doctrine is specially meant for the men and women of our time, then it should be made known to them. It should be preached from every pulpit, so that this marvellous manifestation of Divine Truth may not remain hidden from those for whom it is specially intended by the all-wise Providence of God. It may seem to us that a doctrine apparently so abstruse can hardly be preached with any hope of fruit that it is a waste of time to speak of mystical things instead of insisting, "in season, out of season", on the practical things essential for salvation—prayer, and the Sacraments, and the keeping of the Commandments. We may even fear that it is altogether beyond the grasp of the ordinary people, unlearned in deep theology, so that in preaching it we would deserve St. Paul's reproach to the Corinthians: "So likewise you, except you utter by the tongue plain speech, how shall it be known what is said? For you shall be speaking into the air."

To this difficulty there is an answer which can hardly be gainsaid. What St. Paul could teach to men but recently converted to Christianity can certainly be taught where the Faith has flourished for centuries, and, moreover, we must not overlook the gift of faith implanted in every soul at Baptism, which does not merely aid men in giving their assent to the truths of Revelation, but also enables them to understand these truths and even to penetrate marvellously into their hidden depths. Experience shows that this gift is by no means inactive. Our Catholic children often astonish their teachers by the ease with which they grasp those truths which baffle the learned of the world, and many an unlettered man and woman has a knowledge of divine things which goes far beyond all they have read or heard of them. We are perhaps apt to forget that there are people like the old woman who, lying bedridden with nothing to do but tell her beads, found the whole day too short to finish a Rosary, because, as she said, "there is so much in the Our Father and the Hail Mary".

There is much to be said for the preaching of "practical" sermons—but there is nothing so practical as theory, when theory tends to deepen conviction and to change apathy into fervent devotion; our modern propagandists have taught us a great deal in this respect, and the "war of ideas" in which we are now engaged is a grim proof of what a theory can do to rouse men to action. St. Paul was anxious for the salvation of the souls entrusted to his care, and his converts had grown up among the shameful

vices of degenerate paganism, yet in his Epistles he found time to develop this doctrine, and did not confine himself to moral precepts.

Finally, it is well to notice that the doctrine of the Mystical Body is not so abstruse as its name would indicate. The term "Mystical" attached to it by theologians does not mean that it belongs to those higher realms of the spiritual life to which only the favoured few attain; it simply means the "spiritual body" as opposed to the material body of Christ, and the truths it implies are those familiar, in their simpler form and as separate dogmas, to every Catholic child who has learnt the Catechism. It presents these dogmas from a new angle, gives them a fuller meaning, and lends them a form which is easy to grasp, attractive to the intelligence and to the imagination, and enlists the help of both reason and feeling in drawing men to a deeper and more generous Christian life.

The ways of God are always mysterious, and many of His motives must ever escape us, but with all due reverence and the frank acknowledgment of our insufficiency we may lawfully try to penetrate some little way into His designs, and ask ourselves why the Holy Ghost should have chosen our own times for the particular manifestation of the doctrine of the Mystical Body. The essential idea of this doctrine is that of union—the union of men one with another, and of all with Christ. It was to this that St. Paul returned again and again: "All the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or gentiles, bond or free . . ." "There is neither gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free. But Christ is all, and in all." It would seem then that the Holy Spirit wishes to impress upon us that true unity and charity among men are to be found only in union with Christ—and is there any lesson more suited to the age in which we live? Men are divided today as never before. Nation is divided from nation not merely by difference of origin or diversity of interests, but by the raising of nationalism to an all-embracing creed; men of one nation are divided not merely by class distinctions, but by class hatred. They have seen the danger of these divisions, and are seeking a remedy, but each remedy they have proposed is worse than the disease. They would end class distinctions by inciting the lower classes to rise against the rest, so that all must take a common level or be destroyed. They would end the strife of nations by uniting all men in one vast brotherhood, and they invoke the human nature which all men share as a bond sufficient to establish and preserve that unity; they are too wilfully blind to see that since Cain slew Abel the ties of nature have always been too frail to withstand the pull of selfish interest or of passion which draws men away from each other.

This is the crucial problem of the day; these are the forces at work in individuals and in nations. On the solution of this problem, on the direction given to these forces, depends the fate of our civilization. It is for us, who have the truth, to play our part in saving the world from nameless

anarchy. There is only one true bond of unity, and it is the charity which binds us first to Christ and then to each other as the members of His Body: "You are all one *in Christ Jesus*." There is no universal brotherhood of man, but the sonship of God offered to all men and a common inheritance of grace and glory: "If sons, heirs also: heirs indeed of God, and joint-heirs *with Christ*." There will always be distinctions among men, but there need be no division, since all men, however different be their lot, must love and help each other as the members of the body co-operate to assure the well-being of the whole organism; the humble need not envy the more noble, nor can the great despise those of lower degree, for all must be guided and controlled by the Head, Who cares for all alike: "The rich and poor have met one another: the Lord is the maker of them both." (Prov. xxii, 2.)

T. FINAN, C.S.Sp.

CARMEL IN ENGLAND: THE SEVENTH CENTENARY

HOLY CROSS DAY, 3 May, 1242, has ever been regarded as the date on which was first begun the English Carmelite Province, for it was on that day that the foundation stone of the two first priories was laid. Curiously enough, it is of these two priories—Hulne in Northumberland and Aylesford in Kent—that there still exist the most considerable remains of all the pre-Reformation houses of the Order in England. Until their coming to England the Carmelites had been a congregation of hermits, confined almost entirely to the Holy Land, and it was in England, and under the leadership of an Englishman, St. Simon Stock, that the by no means easy change from an eremitical to a cenobitical form of life was made, and from a small congregation of solitaries the Carmelites became a world-wide mendicant Order on a pattern with the Dominicans or Franciscans.

Although the actual foundation took place in 1242, we must go back to 1236 for its genesis, for it was in that year that Richard, Earl of Cornwall, brother of Henry III, had taken the cross at Winchester, and at last, having made all necessary arrangements, left England in June, 1240,¹ in fulfilment of his vow to go to the Holy Land and fight against the Saracens. Acre was reached on 8 October, and after a little fighting, in which some English knights were killed, the Crusaders were able to fortify Ascalon and make it over to the Emperor's representatives. On their way home again some of the knights made a pilgrimage to Mount Carmel, and among the solitaries living there were pleased to find some Englishmen, who, on being invited,

¹ Cf. Matthew Paris, ii, 397 and 437. (*Rolls Series*.)

were willing to accompany them back to England and make a foundation in that country. Before this date, indeed, on account of the difficult position of Christians in the Holy Land, some Carmelites had gone to Cyprus and others to Sicily. It is probable that the depredations of the Saracens added to the Englishmen's willingness to accompany their fellow countrymen home.

We do not know how many Carmelites were in this first contingent—there must have been twelve at least—nor do we, except in two cases, know their names. They were under the leadership of Ivo of Brittany, a cousin of Alan, Prior of Mount Carmel, and another was Ralph Fresburn, a Northumbrian. One tradition has it that St. Simon Stock was of the party.

The Earl of Cornwall re-embarked for England on 3 May, 1241, and while he personally tarried awhile in Sicily, the bulk of his army, accompanied by the Carmelites, continued their journey, and arrived at Westminster, where the court then was, on Christmas Eve. The Carmelites were introduced into the presence of the king by Lord William Vescy, baron of Alnwick, and Lord Richard Grey, baron of Codnor. These noblemen had been instrumental in bringing the Carmelites from the Holy Land. The king now gave leave for foundations to be made in this country. Sites had to be found for the new monasteries, and it was natural that those who had sponsored the Carmelites before the king should be the chief benefactors to the new foundations. In addition the hermits found friends in Sir Thomas FitzAucher, Sir Ralph de Hempnale, and Sir William de Calthorpe.

One party set out for Bradmer in Norfolk to make a foundation on a site provided by the two last-named knights, another accompanied Sir Thomas FitzAucher to Newenden, near Hastings, while yet another went North to Hulne, near Alnwick, to found a hermitage on the estates of Lord William Vescy. Ralph Fresburn, the leader of this band, was a native of Northumberland who had taken the Cross and gone to the Holy Land some twenty years before the time of which we are speaking. But he did not then return to England: instead, feeling a call to the religious life, he took up his abode on Mount Carmel. When Lord William Vescy visited the hermits of Mount Carmel he was surprised to find one of his own Northumbrian countrymen there, and he besought the Prior to allow Ralph Fresburn to accompany him home and found a Carmelite house in Northumberland. Such is the tradition.

Bale gives a picturesque account of the foundation at Hulne,¹ some three miles from Alnwick. Apparently his benefactor had told Ralph Fresburn that he might choose whatever site seemed most suitable, for after a short rest from their journey Ralph and his brethren began to look about: they inspected all the domain within reach, and a whole weary day passed thus. Dejected and worn out, brother Ralph plunged his staff into the ground, exclaiming with the psalmist: *Si dederò somnum oculis meis,*

¹ British Museum, MS. Harley 3838, Cap. ii, *ex chronicis ordinis.*

et palpebris meis dormitationem: et requiem temporibus meis, donec inveniam locum Domino, tabernaculum Deo Jacob. Yet he did fall asleep for a short while: and great was his surprise on waking to find a spring of water flowing where he had driven his staff into the ground. His whole outlook was now changed and what had previously appeared to him to be an impossible place in which to found his monastery now seemed to have every attraction. *Haec requies mea*, he exclaimed, *hic habitabo quoniam elegi eam.* Indeed the spot was most apt for the purpose he intended and the old chroniclers have seen in Hulne a second Mount Carmel.

The priory at Hulne was always a true hermitage and never attained the importance of the Carmelite houses at Aylesford, London, or Burnham Norton. The Rev. C. H. Hartshorne in his history of *The Feudal and Military Antiquities of Northumberland and the Scottish Border*, after enumerating the modest resources of the priory, says: "Such were the slender possessions of the Carmelite Priory of Hulne; the brethren had certainly but little wealth to boast of." It is not a little surprising, therefore, to find that the Carmelite historian Lezzana credits his brethren of Hulne with an annual revenue of no less than 7,700 Roman crowns at the time of the dissolution of the monasteries; this would represent nowadays a value of some £20,000. It is possible that he confused the Carmelites of Hulne with the neighbouring and important Norbertine Abbey at Alnwick.¹

In later years, after fourteen years spent as provincial, Ralph Fresburn returned to Hulne and died there in 1274. At about the same time Ralph the German, who had been elected Prior-General at the Chapter held in Paris in 1270, resigned his office and retired to the solitude of Hulne, there to end his days in the odour of sanctity, A.D. 1277. We are fortunate in possessing the complete chartulary of the priory, together with the catalogue of its library, and an inventory of vestments and church goods, dating from about 1375.²

The party of Carmelites that set out for Aylesford in Kent, where Lord Grey of Codnor had given them a site about a mile outside the village, and some six miles from Rochester, was under the leadership of Ivo of Britany. St. Simon Stock may have been one of the party. Of this house, too, there are considerable remains: much of the original monastery is still habitable. One part, which dates back to the thirteenth century, shows the original cells, built obviously for an order of hermits, since each forms an independent unit; the rest of the buildings, cloister, dormitories and the like, belong to the second half of the fourteenth century, by which time the Carmelites were a cenobitic order.

Building of the first house at Aylesford, however, went on slowly; seeing that it was some way from the town, and considering its size, this is hardly surprising. Money, too, appears to have been wanting. "As the

¹ The Premonstratensian Abbey of Alnwick was founded in 1147 from the Abbey of Newhouse in Lincolnshire, which in its turn had been founded from Licques, near Calais, in 1143.

² British Museum, MS. Harley 3897.

sum at the disposition of the brethren is insufficient for the construction of their building we grant to all those of our diocesans, and to other persons whose bishops approve this indulgence, thirty days of relaxation of penance due to be performed, if after having confessed and being truly contrite, they contribute of their goods towards the construction of this chapel; . . . given at Trottesclive on the Conversion of St. Paul A.D. 1246". So runs an indulgence of the bishop of Rochester. The appeal appears to have been successful, for the church was consecrated on 31 August, 1248.

It was at Aylesford that the first General Chapter of the Carmelite Order to be celebrated in Europe was held. It assembled there at Whitsuntide, 1247. This Chapter had to deal with two matters of extreme importance: the election of a new Prior-General, and the modification of the primitive Rule to suit the new circumstances of the Order. In place of Alan the Breton, St. Simon Stock was elected Prior-General, and he at once set about his task with such energy and practical sense that in many ways he may be regarded as the second founder of the Order. With the consent of the Chapter he dispatched two of the brethren¹ to Lyons, where the papal court then was, to ask for modifications of the primitive rule so that the Carmelite Order might be adapted to European conditions. By 26 July they had obtained what they asked, and Innocent IV gave them a Bull of approbation. The Rule was submitted to two Dominicans, the famous Hugh of St. Cher and William of Anterade,² that they might make the necessary modifications. Their work was finished on 1 September, and a month later the Pope approved the alterations in a further Bull.³ The chief points of the changes thus made included the new obligation of taking their meals in the common refectory, and not, as heretofore, each hermit in his cell, a certain relaxation of the law of perpetual abstinence; meat was now allowed on sea voyages, and the brethren might partake of vegetables cooked in meat when they ate outside their monastery; a mitigation of the silence which in the original Rule lasted from the end of Vespers until after Terce the next day; this the papal revisers changed to the usual monastic custom (the end of Compline until after Prime); the provision of a common dormitory in place of the detached cells hitherto in use. But the greatest change of all, and the one that was to have the most far-reaching effects, was brought about by the insertion of the following paragraph in the second chapter of the Rule of St. Albert:

¹ Probably Reginald and Peter Folsham.

² For the appointment of the two commissaries see *Bullarium Romanum* (ed. 1740), iii, 314. William, bishop of Anterade (*alias* Tortosa in Syria), was probably a native of Reading, which he is said to have visited in 1249 or 1246 (Matthew Paris, v, 72 and vi, 116), and to have described to the monks of Reading Abbey the sad persecution of Christians in the Holy Land. If the latter date is the correct one it seems certainly possible that he was known to St. Simon Stock and was therefore suggested by him as a commissioner for the revision of the Carmelite Rule on account of his knowledge of the Holy Land and, consequently, of the Carmelites in the country of their origin and of the conditions under which the primitive rule was practised. (I am indebted to the Rev. Walter Gumbley, O.P., F.R.Hist.S., for the above information about William of Anterade.)

³ *Bullarium Romanum* (ed. 1740), iii, 314.

CONCERNING THE PLACES IN WHICH CONVENTS MAY BE FOUNDED

“You may have convents in solitary places or in others which are given to you, if they are convenient and apt for the observances of your rule, according as it may seem to the Prior and Brethren.”

It is this paragraph which effectively changed the Carmelite Order from one not unlike the Carthusians into a mendicant order, almost as popular as the Franciscans or the Dominicans. There is still mention, it will be noticed, of the solitary places, but it is those “others” which begin to concern us now: the outskirts of the towns, and even the greater cities, began to have their Carmelite priories. The effect of this ordinance is seen at once in England. Within the next eight years foundations were made at Oxford, York, London and Norwich, whilst the house at Bradmer situated in a “solitary place” was transferred to Burnham Norton, and that of Cambridge, originally at Chesterton, some miles from the university town, was moved there in 1249.

As the Carmelite Order owes so much to St. Simon Stock it is necessary to say something of him here. Unfortunately the sources for his life are very fragmentary, and it is difficult to discover any trustworthy information regarding him until the time of his election as sixth General of the Order. It is usually asserted that he was born in Kent in or about 1165 of noble parents, and according to the same legend he takes his surname from the fact that he lived as a hermit from the age of twelve in the trunk of a tree; after twenty years of such a life he joined the Carmelites when they came to England. Another tradition says he went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land and, having joined the Order at the monastery of Mount Carmel itself, came to England with the first colony to reach this country in 1241. This seems more probable. There are many difficulties in the first legend. The Carmelites came to England in 1241. But according to the legend St. Simon must have become a Carmelite in 1197, nearly half a century before the arrival of the Order in England.

The legend also says that St. Simon died a centenarian. We know that the date of his death was 1265. But there is no evidence, beyond the word of John Grossi, writing one hundred and fifty years after the event, that St. Simon was so old when he died. It seems, to say the least, hardly likely that his brethren would have elected him General at so difficult a time when he was already well over eighty, and when the man of their choice had to be an organizer and energetic to cope with the new orientation of the Order. Nor is it likely that if he had been elected at so advanced an age he would have displayed just those very qualities which we know him to have possessed—indeed, one of the few facts we do know about him—and that he would have journeyed about making foundations not only in England and Gascony, but as far afield as Sicily. The fact is that from contemporary evidence we know nothing of him at all before the year

1247, and previous to this date all is pure conjecture. The general consensus of opinion seems to be that after a short period as a hermit in England he made his way to the Holy Land, and there, having come in contact with the primitive Carmelites, he continued on Mount Carmel his former eremitical mode of life until in 1241 he set out with Ivo the Breton, Ralph Fresburn and others for England.

St. Simon Stock's policy as General certainly saved the Order in England and in Europe. He showed great spirit in face of the immense difficulties the Order was facing everywhere. He was in favour, as we have seen, of a mixed life for the friars, partly contemplative, partly active, instead of the purely contemplative and eremitical life they had led until this time; under his influence houses were founded in the university towns, not only that the studies of the brethren might be made with greater care and thoroughness, but so that the Order might attract subjects of intellectual worth. The hope was realized. In spite of the fact that the Dominicans and Franciscans had been first in the field, several young men took the habit, and the new foundations began to be well filled. We have seen that in 1247 certain modifications were made in the rule, and it is probable that even as early as this some of the English novices found it too severe. Now with the advent of the university students the same difficulties recurred. For the Carmelite rule, based as it was on regulations intended primarily for oriental hermits, was strict even after the modifications introduced in 1247. It is hardly surprising that St. Simon Stock had to reckon with the discouragement of some of his subjects.

Nevertheless the years 1247-56 saw the development of the Order in England, and indeed in Europe; it was a rapid development, and for this reason difficulties of all sorts were not slow in coming, but thanks to the wise and energetic government of St. Simon they were eventually surmounted and the Carmelites took their place as one of the great mendicant orders.

It is worth recalling that though the Carmelites have for many centuries been known in England as the Whitefriars they were not entitled to the name when they first came to this country, for they did not then wear the well-known white mantle, but a striped one. St. Simon Stock knew no other, for it was only some twenty years after his death that the Order abandoned it in favour of the plain white one. An old tradition says that in the earliest ages of the Order, in Palestine, the hermits wore a white mantle, and that they were compelled to change it by the Saracens, who considered white as the distinguishing mark of their own dignitaries. In any case the Carmelites came to Europe and to England wearing mantles which were composed of four black and three white stripes from which they were at first known as *Fratres de Pica*, or Pied Friars. A reference to these striped mantles is found in the contemporary lines:

*De Carmelo veniunt fratres virgulati
Hi ut vulgo dicitur fratres sunt beati.¹*

¹ Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae Scriptores*, XXV, p. 358.

A General Chapter of the Order affirmed that the seven stripes of the mantle represented the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost; others saw in them a reference to the four Gospels and the three religious virtues; a popular explanation was that the black stripes represented those on the folded mantle of Elias which fell from him as he was taken up into heaven in the fiery chariot; the inner folds, untouched by the fire, remained white, only the outside of the mantle being scorched. (Cf. 4 Kings ii, 8-13.)

The first Carmelites in Europe were not proud of their singular appearance, though in 1281 a General Chapter held in London laid down definitely, so as to secure uniformity, that the mantle should consist of three white and four black stripes. It is this decree, no doubt, that leads Rishanger¹ to say that the striped mantle was abandoned in that year. At all events in 1287 oral permission was given by Honorius IV for a change to be made, but the Pope died before anything was done, and an affidavit had to be obtained from the Cardinal who had negotiated the matter lest any other religious order whose habit was white should show opposition. The document mentions that the striped mantle was the cause of not a little scandal and damage to the Order. The change was published at the General Chapter held at Montpellier in 1287, and in the English province at the Provincial Chapter of Lincoln in September of the same year. The Premonstratensians objected,² and the Osney chronicler speaking of the matter sees fit to say that the Carmelites had adopted the white mantle "no one knows by whose authority or for what reason, except perhaps impelled by their own vanity".³

LANCELOT C. SHEPPARD.

"PLAIN SUBSTITUTED BUILDINGS"

PARISHES which have suffered damage to church property by enemy action are rightly concerned to discover on what scale and in what way compensation is likely to be made. We know that the final settlement of claims cannot be made until after the war. Much time and labour is being spent now on working out a scheme which is fair and reasonable. It is not easy; and it is unlikely that everyone will be completely satisfied, but it is already possible to point out some of the essential principles

¹ *Hic Martinus Papa cappas fratrum Carmelitarum mutavit in album quae prius erant stragulatae, radiatae et birratae.* (Chronica, Rolls Series, p. 97.) The decree of the General Chapter referred to runs: *Frater professus habeat unam carpetam (cappam) quae est nostrae religionis signum . . . et habeat septem radias tantum ut simus uniformes . . .* (Acta Cap. Gen., I, p. 15).

² MS. Selden 41, Bodleian Library. Boniface VIII confirmed the change by letter, 25 November, 1295.

³ *Annales Monastici*, Rolls Series, iv, 312.

involved, in the hope that when any scheme is announced it may be fairly intelligible.

Under the War Damage Act properties held by charitable trusts and occupied for charitable purposes were entirely exempted from contributions for war damage. The Government gave a pledge that compensation would not be reduced nor postponed by reason of this exemption. The dominant motive for this exemption and this pledge was officially stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It is the deliberate policy of the Government that so far as is possible charitable activities and in particular religion shall not suffer as a result of enemy action. We must, however, point out a further practical reason. Many properties held by charitable trusts, and especially buildings used for public worship, have never been assessed, either for taxes or rates, and no basis on which contributions could have been levied exists. The practical problem of assessing contributions on much of the property was therefore very difficult, if not insoluble. It will be seen from what follows that rating experts have had to devise methods of assessing the value of property not normally marketable; and it is extremely important to understand how a church would have been valued if it had been necessary to try to do so.

The purpose of the War Damage Act is that any decrease of the value of any property as at March 1939, owing to material damage caused by enemy action, shall be made good after the war from a fund raised partly by contributions from property owners, partly from general taxation. Although property held and occupied for charitable purposes pays no contribution it is the intention of the Government to restore it to its March 1939 value. When property has been damaged seriously one of the first questions that must be asked is just this: What was its value in March 1939? This, in the case of many properties, is not easy to answer.

We need not discuss insoluble special problems, such as the value of Westminster Abbey or Canterbury Cathedral in 1939; indeed it is difficult to assess the value of any of the ancient parish churches of England. If we confine ourselves to Roman Catholic churches it is often very difficult to reach even an approximate figure for comparatively simple and modern churches. The amount for which trustees might wish to insure a building against fire is often quite arbitrary.

The cost of erection has little bearing on the question. It does not help us to know that a Catholic church cost £12,000 in 1880 or £10,000 in 1850. No one would seriously contend that the cost of building a parish church in 1350 or 1450, even if we knew it, could provide any basis of valuation in 1939. It will be seen from what follows that even in the extreme case of a church newly erected and just completed in 1939 many other considerations are relevant besides the actual cost.

It is useless to ask what a particular church would have fetched if exposed for sale in the open market. The normal answer to this question is that a church building has no ascertainable market value. When sold, a church

is generally demolished and only site value (less cost of demolition) remains. In rare cases one denomination sells a church to another denomination at an arranged figure; sometimes a chapel is converted into a building used for secular purposes. Instances of such transfers of property will occur to many readers; but they do not provide a useful basis of valuation. There is a restriction on the sale of all Anglican buildings used for public worship; only the site can be sold, the buildings must be demolished. Some Non-conformist denominations buy and sell their chapels fairly frequently, but most of these chapels are comparatively plain and simple in character, and the transaction is generally completed by a private bargain. There is no open market for the kind of building which is most difficult to value. It remains true that the market value of a church is certainly unascertainable and is probably nil. It has only site value.

The only method of approach we can in practice use is to ask how a building would have been assessed for rates if that had been necessary. This principle gets away completely from two impossible methods of valuation: (1) Cost of erection, and (2) Market value.

The class of properties not normally marketable is much larger than the inexperienced person perhaps imagines. It includes a very great number of the properties held by charitable trusts, e.g. hospitals and public schools; it includes also many properties held by the Crown, by municipalities or by public utilities, e.g. barracks, police-stations, town halls, public libraries, railway stations. The methods used by rating authorities are therefore very relevant to our question. If a parish priest should be inclined to put an impossibly high value on his church, he might reconsider the matter if he found himself having to pay rates on it at his own valuation!

We have now to introduce a term which is likely to be new to many readers, but which may be more familiar to some in the immediate future. When rating authorities are compelled to assess a building like the Hall of an Oxford or Cambridge College or of a City Company they ask what it would cost at the present time to erect a building adequate for the purpose and of reasonable dignity, but shorn of ornament and excess space. It is from this ascertainable cost that we must start if we are to reach a reasonable figure on which rates must be paid.

The usual term for this "notional value" is "the cost of a plain substituted building". It is familiar in rating practice; the standard example is the Hall of Magdalen College, Oxford. Clearly there is an analogy between the valuation of such a building and the valuation of an ecclesiastical building used for public worship. It is not a perfect analogy, since the space required in a College Hall is determinable fairly accurately, while a church might reasonably require to have seating accommodation for more than its normal Sunday congregation in order that it might be available for special services. Nevertheless no better analogy can be found, and it is certain that the cost of a plain substituted building will be applied as a basis for fixing the value at March 1939 of any building used for public

religious worship. This is the maximum value that ought to be assigned to any such building. It has no relation to its market value (which is possibly nil), nor to its actual cost (since a tiny chapel may be an elaborately decorated building in marble and alabaster).

The conclusions to be drawn are important. No building, however elaborately decorated and costly, can in any circumstances receive more compensation for war damage than its total notional value in 1939; that is, than the cost of a plain substituted building. If the cost of repairs to a partially damaged building exceeds the total cost of a plain substituted building, as in some cases it may, then the principle still applies. It is hoped that in all cases of "total loss" the cost of erecting a plain substituted building will be received in compensation, but that is the maximum possible. The term "total loss" is in fact highly technical; it includes not only obvious examples of complete demolition and also of churches damaged so much that repair is not economically reasonable, but it *also* includes all damage so extensive that repair would cost more than "the cost of a plain substituted building".

Another conclusion is manifest. The familiar question is going to be asked: Is this building really necessary? We are bound in conscience to ask ourselves this question before accepting compensation. It is included in the very idea of a plain substituted building. It will be useful to think out for ourselves what this question involves. A plain substituted building is defined as "adequate for its purpose", that is to say, large enough but not too large for the purpose for which the damaged building was used in March 1939. It cannot be larger, it might be smaller, and if no good case can be made out for the necessity of the damaged building in March 1939, it will be non-existent. That is to say in an extreme case a damaged building might have been completely redundant in March 1939 and therefore might have had no value. It would not have been worth while to pay rates on it. If rates had been payable it would have been sold for other purposes or demolished.

Catholic architects might do well to consider the economic effect of this on their professional work. Catholic public worship can be adequately provided in buildings less elaborate than some of our contemporary Catholic churches; perhaps it is well that we should aim at a very considerable simplification. We cannot justly or reasonably ask for gratuitous compensation from other property holders and from taxpayers greater in amount than the minimum necessary for our spiritual work, and we ought to do all in our power to help the Government to carry out its very generous pledge that the real essential work of religion shall not suffer as a result of enemy action. It will do us good to fix our minds on the essential spiritual work we are trying to do, and to see that our limited resources are being used well in order to provide the material objects that are really necessary, and only such as are necessary.

WILLIAM JAMES ANDERSON.

THE LIFE TO COME

IN one of the finest pages of the *Apologia* Newman has described the tragedy of human history: "the disappointments of life, the defeat of good, the success of evil, physical pain, mental anguish, the prevalence and intensity of sin, the pervading idolatries, the corruptions, the dreary hopeless irreligion", which make the sight of the world nothing else than the prophet's scroll, full of "lamentations, and mourning, and woe". Our generation has cause to remember those words. Twice they have been the picture of our life. It is therefore not surprising if melancholy has marked us for her own. "Sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt."

But we must never lose hope. "O passi graviora, dabit Deus his quoque finem." Even if we cannot share the facile optimism of Browning and declare that "all's right with the world", still "God's in His Heaven". Our part must be not to let ourselves be engulfed by events, like men caught in an ocean in tempest. God helping, we can ride the storm. Indeed, since it is a storm of men's raising, we can work effectively to quell it by the potent influence of Catholic thought. In that struggle of minds which is behind the struggle of arms Catholic theology has its place. It is no anchorite system, called apart from the world's grim debate. It has a duty to enter the combat, to hearten the minds which seem to be "all in an enormous dark drowned" and by the living and effectual power of the word of God to bring order out of chaos, light out of darkness, and life out of death.

Unfortunately the many preoccupations of our times, the paper restrictions, and the closing down of intercommunication between peoples hamper the effectiveness of Catholic theology. But where opportunity offers, it must be taken. We welcome, then, Fr. M. C. D'Arcy's latest book, *Death and Life*,¹ precisely because it is opportune; it is Catholic theology trying to help and influence the struggling minds of men in a way in which they most need help. For the question of the life to come is a fundamental one, particularly insistent and much discussed in these days of despair. All such basic religious and ethical truths rise to the surface of man's mind in times of crisis. He begins to hope at least, if not yet to believe, that they are true; and in that hope he feels a little of spring warmth in the winter of his discontents. In the piping times of peace he might not cast a thought into a future beyond the grave. But now he looks wistfully up the arches of the years. As Fr. D'Arcy says, the spirit of man cannot reconcile itself to a black-out of existence.

Fr. D'Arcy divides his book into two parts. In the first he discusses the intimations of immortality which right reason provides. There is the constant, universal belief of man in a life after death. It is the argument from "sensus communis", familiar in the text-books of philosophy. Re-

¹ Longmans Green & Co. Pp. xii, 180. 5s.

ligious customs in all lands attest this permanent belief. So too does the difficulty man finds in reconciling himself to the notion of extinction; the "non omnis moriar" of the poet strikes a chord of sympathy in every human heart. The source of that universal belief is to be found, partly at least, in man's awareness of a duality in his nature. He is in part material, having kinship with the brute and the inanimate worlds. But he is in part something else, mind, will, spirit, a self, by which he is sharply distinguished from any material thing; and by his spirit he lives in a world which knows no decay or death. "He has mental powers and desires which have a different pattern from that of mortal things which come to be, reach their maturity and pass away. Thought is not a succession in time; it estimates time and tries to define it. Truth has no limitation to time or place; science is not like spawn which belongs to certain seasons and is determined in its variations by ancestry and environment; the ideals of love and goodness ascend in spirals further and further away from earth, though man grow old in body and feel his sensible powers depart from him" (pp. 94, 95). Very beautifully and effectively Fr. D'Arcy develops these arguments, with some trenchant criticism of those scientists and others who venture to cross his path. If he cannot quite make up his mind whether to conceive the relation of the soul to the body after the manner of Plato or that of Aristotle, his hesitations do not affect the strength and persuasiveness of his treatment of his main theme.

In the second part he passes to the Christian doctrine of the after-life. The themes are "non nova sed nove". It is the familiar ground of the intimate connection of holiness of life with immortality, of the fact and nature of God's gift of His intimacy to man in the supernatural order (a particularly excellent chapter), of Hell, Purgatory and Heaven. But the familiar is not given in the dry-as-dust, Latinistic manner of the textbooks, which makes so much of our Catholic theological literature unpalatable and indeed unintelligible to the average educated English mind. There is always that mastery of phrase and illustration, that dignity, clearness and strength of style which make Fr. D'Arcy's writings agreeable to the ordinary reader and valuable as works of Catholic Apologetic. He gets theology out into the world of human thought, where it can be and ought to be, as we said earlier, a creative influence for good.

The author's recurrent theme, which gives unity and coherence to his book, is the existence of the human person and his dignity as a man, but particularly as a child of God's supernatural predilection. Time and again Fr. D'Arcy insists on the greatness of the individual man, how each man is a world in miniature, master of the world by thought and reason, holding his own destiny within his choices, moving the world, in a sense, by the choices he makes, calling to the Infinite Truth and Love Himself by his unlimited capacity for knowledge and love. Fr. D'Arcy makes man feel his grandeur and thereby lifts him free of the crushing weight of materialism which would make of him merely a clever animal, whose end is no different

from a dog's. Fr. D'Arcy's is Shakespeare's theme: "What a piece of work is a man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form, in moving, how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals!"

This is man as true reason reveals him. "But," to quote Fr. D'Arcy, "this light on man is nothing to that which is cast on him by the doctrine of Redemption. Not only is the extraordinary fact revealed that God cares infinitely for each individual man, but so catastrophic is a free human act that the Son of God dies upon a tree to repair it" (p. 104). And again: "God so works on human nature as to exalt it beyond all its capacities. The love of God has not left us wandering on the circumference of beauty, but has drawn us into the centre, into the divine privy council. We are so played upon by this divine affection that we are rendered capable of loving with God's love, and seeing with God's eyes, seeing His beauty and the radiance of that beauty as it gives being to all things and pours out into the myriad reflections so like our own" (pp. 120, 121).¹

In insisting on this undying glory of man, with all that it entails, Fr. D'Arcy goes right to the heart of Christianity, and sets our view of the present course of events in its true perspective. In storms of soul man needs an anchor, or better a foundation, something rock-like that cannot be shaken. The doctrine of man's supernatural dignity and of his immortal destiny, if he is true to his God and his better self, is exactly that rock. Set upon it, we have a sure hope in our temptations to despair. Without it these would be insuperable. We might go on, trying to forget sorrows which cannot be forgotten; we might try to cling to a doctrine of "carpe diem", but such a doctrine rings very hollow in a universal war. The only logical action would be to accept as inevitable a complete breakdown of civilization, in which only material might should rule. For belief in eternity is something more than a consolation. It is a stimulus, and the only stimulus for fallen man, to a full human life. The history of Christianity proves it. "Our laws of justice and goodwill, our courteous manners, our respect for life, our hospitals and Universities, our art, our sense of human dignity, which is now threatened, all these things which have made life on earth cultured instead of barbaric, human instead of cruel, and so precious that we do not want to leave it even for a future happiness, have been given to us by that very Christianity which teaches the doctrine of eternal life" (p. ix). Hence, "for the health of human society and the restoration after the war of those values which insure peace within as well as without, we must be inhabitants of two worlds" (p. x). In the vision of the heavenly Jerusalem lies our only hope of building an earthly Jerusalem in England's green and pleasant land.

J. CARTMELL.

¹ One notices, as a criticism, that in discussing "personality" Fr. D'Arcy seems to be rather shy of "substance", and lays rather undue emphasis on consciousness. But then Ripalda began his great classic on the Supernatural, I believe, with a faulty definition of the supernatural.

HOMILETICS

Second Sunday of Advent

THE first half of today's Gospel is concerned with the signs whereby Christ, the Messiah, is known or recognisable. Let us first examine the answer given by Our Lord to John's question, and then apply it in its allegorical or spiritual meaning to the Church of our time. "Go and relate to John what you have heard and seen. The blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, the poor have the gospel preached to them."

Is Our Lord referring to actual miracles? The answer, though not the complete answer is, clearly, Yes. We know from St. Luke (vii, 21) that Our Lord was working miracles at the very moment John's disciples arrived. He is referring to the miracles they had just seen, miracles which fulfil the prophecy of Isaias concerning Him. But we know also that He was attaching to His miracles a deeper spiritual meaning (cf. Luke v, 24). Miraculous power over the body is frequently accompanied by a corresponding influence over the soul. This may be witnessed at Lourdes in our own day, where the body is sometimes miraculously cured as a symbol of a deeper spiritual healing which is much more frequent. So also Our Lord's words refer not only to the miracles, but to the illumination and strengthening of the spiritual faculties and the enabling of man's soul, as the sign of His divine mission. Through contact with Him man is spiritually enlightened, strengthened, cleansed and revived. He is the Truth that men may see; the Way that men may walk; the Life whereby men live. Through this influence He is manifested.

This spiritual witness to Christ has a special significance in our own day. Our Lord no longer walks the earth with men; but the world finds contact with Him in two important ways: (a) by means of the Faithful, because through His works in us men recognize His power; (b) through the Church, because through Her and Her members His power to enlighten, heal and strengthen others is manifested to the world.

This twofold manifestation entails a corresponding responsibility on the part of the Faithful: (i) We must witness to Our Lord by remaining close to Him in a life of Christian dedication. His redeeming power is manifested in us for the world to see. In a word: By our fruits shall men know Him; so that those who confess Christ with their lips and deny Him with their lives not only imperil their own souls but are a scandal to Christ's cause. Men judge Him not by what we say, but by how we live. (ii) As organic members of Christ's Mystical Body we must radiate, each according to his several function, from the Sovereign Pontiff and Oecumenical Council to the humblest layman, the Truth, Way and Life that enlightens, guides and revivifies men. We said: To the humblest layman; for no one is exempt from this apostolate. Within the Church is found the strengthening and life-giving power of the sacraments; Her doctrine is holy; She is entrusted with the deposit of Faith; She has official teachers in her Bishops and Priests. But in the vanguard of Christ's Church is the lay-apostle. In him principally is vested the power of permeating, leavening, the mass of

mankind. He must know and live his Faith; through him Christ finds contact with the minds and hearts of men.

But here we meet a difficulty peculiar to our own times. Through the prevalence of propaganda men are ceasing to think for themselves. As the wealth of the world tends to accumulate in the hands of the few, so the opinions of the world tend to be dictated by the few who control the modern apparatus of diffusion: radio, press and film. These opinions, and often false statements in the guise of accepted incontrovertible dogmas, are impressed by continual, tireless reiteration upon the receptive millions. Amongst these accepted statements are what may be called the dogmas of negation. Communists, for example, will deny the existence of God, the entire Gospel narrative, the possibility of personal immortality. They deny them not because they have faced the possibility that these things may be true, and have examined and rejected them, but because they refuse to consider them at all. As the result of this propaganda comparatively few men nowadays are convinced by reasoning: the modern mind will even admit, at times, the conclusion of a faultless logical sequence without being convinced by it. Confronted by this truly Satanic activity, how is Christ the Redeemer to meet the multitude? Of what value is the written or spoken word? Or Catholic propaganda? Is it not waste of time to try to cast out devils in the name of Beelzebub? There is only one answer: The word must be made flesh. We must live our Faith, live Christ; take Christ to our fellow men in selfless, devoted service; return love for hatred; combat falsehood by a living, transparent, sincerity and truthfulness; live chastely in a world that knows no shame; treasure meekness amidst the world's vainglory; exalt God. In a word, we must recapture the spirit of Christ's Sermon on the Mount. This is the duty of all; but particularly of our Catholic lay-apostles.

Third Sunday of Advent

The Pharisees came to question John the Baptist concerning the new rite of Baptism: "Why then dost thou baptize, if thou be not Christ, nor Elias, nor the prophet?" John answering said: "I baptize with water; but there hath stood one in the midst of you, whom you know not. The same is he that shall come after me, who is preferred before me; the latchet of whose shoe I am not worthy to loose." This reply was more than an answer: it was a condemnation.

If the Pharisees hardly knew what to make of John, he himself was never in doubt what to think of them. "And seeing many of the Pharisees and the Sadducees coming to his baptism, he said to them: Ye brood of vipers, who hath shewed you to flee from the wrath to come?" (Matt. iii, 7). He was anxious to save them ("Bring forth therefore fruit worthy of penance"; Matt. v, 8), but the pity he felt for the simple people who were being duped by their hypocrisy roused him to anger. "Ye brood of vipers." The viper is a hidden, unsuspected danger. The common people trusted and respected the Pharisees as models for imitation, the indispensable instruments of God. "Ye brood of vipers." John's cry was a warning to the multitude.

Our Lord Himself was later to thunder at this same pride and hypocrisy: "Woe to ye scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because you devour the houses of widows, praying long prayers." And warning His disciples He said: "All their works they do for to be seen of men. For they make their phylacteries broad, and enlarge their fringes. And they love the first places at feasts, and the first chairs in the synagogues, and salutations in the market-place and to be called by men, Rabbi. . . . Woe to you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because you make clean the outside of the cup and of the dish, but within are full of rapine and uncleanness" (Matt. xxiii).

The Pharisees came to John. They were jealous of his influence with the people; enraged at his interference and innovations. Their supremacy was being challenged. No doubt, in their hearts, they were hoping that he would prove an impostor, like Judas the Galilean, who had sealed his own fate by leading a revolt against the temporal power. They came to John, not to repent, but to ask questions (Luke vii, 29, 30). After all, it was hardly to be expected that these men who claimed a certain exclusive sinlessness, who were "not as the rest of men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers" (Luke xviii, 11), would come as self-accused, repentant sinners to be baptized. Whatever they thought of his answer to their question, they were too self-absorbed to see in this humble man a living condemnation of their pride. "The same is he that shall come after me, who is preferred before me: the latchet of whose shoe I am not worthy to loose."

John the Baptist was the last and greatest of the prophets—a towering personality. The other prophets had shone brilliantly in the dark firmament of the Old Law; but John is too near the dawn for easy recognition and assessment. He stood a lone figure in splendid contrast to his times; a man of great wisdom and little learning; voluntarily stripped of this world's goods; of great personal magnetism, yet, as he insisted, only a Voice—the mere echo of another's will, the herald of another's greatness. John the Baptist, in contrast to the Pharisees, was utterly self-less. He called the world to penance and the multitude flocked to him in the desert; but this popularity was for him only the means to an end: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight his paths" (Mark i, 3). There was about him an unexpected graciousness which we can only suppose was the sheen of his humility. St. John the Evangelist tells us that after John had been imprisoned, his disciples went to him and complained about Our Lord. "John answered and said: A man cannot receive anything, unless it be given him from heaven. You yourselves do bear me witness, that I said, I am not Christ, but that I am sent before him. He that hath the bride is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom, who standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth with joy because of the bridegroom's voice. This my joy therefore is fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease" (John iii, 27 *seq.*). Truly, only a great man could have uttered these words, a man of deep culture, humbly abandoned to God's will. "Amen I say to you, there hath not risen among them that are born of women a greater than John the Baptist" (Matt. xi, 11).

To herald the coming of the Redeemer John the Baptist called the chosen people to repentance—to acknowledge publicly, by baptism, that they were sinners. So should we prepare for Christ's coming at Christmas.

To the proud, John would say: "There stands one in the midst of you whom you know not." The humble will acknowledge with him that they are unworthy to unloose the latchet of His shoe (the thong or lace of His sandal). The gates of heaven are opened wide to little children. Only when we realize our sinfulness, our utter dependence on Him, can we seek and find God in a manger.

Fourth Sunday of Advent

This incident is part of the larger scene by the lakeside, when Our Lord appeared to the disciples for the third time after His Resurrection. He had eaten with them (even prepared the meal Himself (John xxi, 9); and turning to Peter He said: "Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me? and he said to Him: Lord, Thou knowest all things: Thou knowest that I love Thee. And He said to him: Feed My sheep" (John xxi, 17). Our Lord then foretold that Peter would die for Him: "Thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and lead thee whither thou wouldst not. And this he said, signifying by what death he should glorify God. And when he had said this, he saith to him: Follow Me."

Peter followed; but turning, noticed someone else behind. It was John; he was following too. How, indeed, could John, having seen Our Lord again, keep away from Him? He had been drawn irresistibly from the very beginning (John i, 38). Calvary could not separate them (John xix, 26); and now at the end: "Peter, turning about, saw that disciple whom Jesus loved—following."

Peter, calling Our Lord, said: "Lord, and what shall this man do?" We must not conclude that Peter was jealous, or annoyed, or even curious. A few moments ago Our Lord had asked him three times: "Simon . . . lovest thou Me?" Our Lord was too gracious to relate these questions explicitly to Peter's threefold denial. But Peter knew what was in Our Lord's mind; and now he realized more than ever how empty had been his former boasts of love and allegiance, and how dependent he was on the sustaining power of Christ. He was thinking of martyrdom. He argued: Jesus has asked me three times whether I love Him, and now He is convinced of my love; He has forgiven my pride and treachery, and promises that I shall die for Him. If then I who love Him so little shall die for Him, surely John, "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (John xxi, 20), and "who also leaned on His breast at supper", will be asked to give his life too.

Our Lord replies: "If I will have him to remain till I come, what is it to thee? Follow thou me." ("If" is a more accurate rendering than "So".) The sense is, therefore: If it were My intention to let him remain till the very end of time, what is it to thee? Your duty is to follow Me as you have been told.

Our Lord is insisting on complete, unquestioning submission to His will. Those die for Him whom He elects to die. Martyrdom is not the fulfilment of a personal daydream or ambition (Mark xiv, 29-31); nor even a privilege reserved for the highest sanctity (e.g. St. Joseph, Mary Magdalen). To lay down one's life has little importance unless it be in obedience to Christ's will. His will is preferable to martyrdom; obedience

better than the greatest sacrifice. Our Lord could not have insisted more forcibly on the role of obedience in His Church. He Himself was "*obedient unto death*". It were better that even the beloved disciple should live on and on till His second coming and forgo the crown of martyrdom if such were Christ's will. Peter, too, must do as he is told without question or argument. "Follow Me." This "following" in his case will include the strength and grace of martyrdom because Our Lord has so ordained.

This command—"Follow Me"—has been given to all Christians. We must seek Christ's will and *do it* without question. Not what we shall judge right or reasonable, or even difficult, should we do, but only what He shall command. Obedience is doing what He asks of us, precisely *because He asks*: the *expression* of His will is the formality of our obedience as the expression of the Father's will was the formality of His: "as the Father hath given me commandment, so do I" (John xiv, 31). We must follow Him not because we think it safe or wise, but *because He leads*. There is often conflict in life between the findings of human wisdom and God's law; we prefer to explore our own way to life and happiness, selecting human leaders and saviours. But this way inevitably ends in disaster. Christ's will is creative; obedience to His will sweeps us into the main stream of His creative activity. The rebel will is unproductive, sterile; it puts man at variance with his own nature, depopulates the home, and ends always in the desolation and destruction of war. Revolt against Christ is self-destructive and fratricidal. Instinctively men realize this when, in our own time, they endow human leaders with a divine inerrancy, as the only rational basis of obedience and submission. For men feel, at heart, both a deep distrust of merely human leadership and the instinctive need of an allegiance that is binding and rational, even blind. This instinctive yearning of the human heart, supported by the failure of the God-less, human experiment of our time, must lead men to Christ; for in Him alone men find human leadership that is Divine.

Sunday within the Octave of Christmas

When the tongue of Zachary, John's father, was loosed (Luke i, 67) "filled with the Holy Ghost" he prophesied. This prophetic canticle—the *Benedictus*—contains the following stanza: "And thou, child, shall be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord *to prepare his ways*." The figure—"to prepare His ways"—is borrowed from Isaias xl, 3: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the wilderness the paths of our God," and is adopted by John the Baptist as descriptive of his vocation. He adds the next verse (Isaias xl, 4), viz. "Every valley should be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall be made straight and the rough ways plain."

These words of John have a literal and spiritual meaning.

Literal: In the East an illustrious visitor is sometimes honoured by the construction of a special road along which he will travel. For example a road was made from the Damascus Gate to the Mount of Olives for William II, the Emperor of Germany, in 1898. Such a road, to be worthy of the occasion, must be level, that is, the high ground must be excavated

and the low-lying ground filled in, to avoid too steep a gradient: it must also be straight, i.e. direct; and smooth, i.e. surfaced. "Every valley shall be filled; and every mountain and hill shall be brought low; and the crooked shall be made straight; and the rough ways plain."

St. John the Baptist prepared the way for Christ: he was the road-maker. He preached penance: "Do penance: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. iii, 2). "And there went out to him all the country of Judea, and all they of Jerusalem, and were baptized by him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins" (Mark i, 5). By this public confession of sin the pride of the nation was "made low". God is everything. Man can only return, reflect, God's gifts; he has nothing of himself.

But John did not leave them dripping with the waters of shame. He unlifted their hearts in hope. "The kingdom of God is at hand." "There cometh after me one mightier than I" (Mark i, 6).

John made the way to Christ straight and smooth: he took men to the Messiah directly, quickly, easily. The other prophets of the Old Law had spoken of the coming Messiah vaguely, from afar: he led repentant sinners to Him. John both prophesied and *awaited* His coming. He saw Him, touched Him, pointed Him out among the bystanders: "This is the Son of God . . . and beholding Jesus walking he said: Behold the Lamb of God" (John i, 34-6). With these words the age of prophecy was ended; the way completed.

The way was made more direct and smooth because the Prophet himself was the way: he was humble, hopeful; he acknowledged the Messiah and was his friend (John iii, 29): John's message was confirmed by his life.

Spiritual application: Men have left, outlawed, God. If we are to invite Him back into our world, we must prepare the way for His coming: we must call men to repentance, to a sense of shame which they have lost, to worship—and through worship to humility; inspire men with a renewed hope; save them from the meandering expedients of human wisdom, and take them direct to Christ. For He is in our midst: The Church is Christ.

Men will find Him the more easily if we bear *living* witness to the world's Redeemer; for like John the Baptist we are not only the Road-makers but the Road. Let us therefore invite Christ Our Lord into our own hearts through sincere repentance, humility, hope; through union with Him in the Mystical Body and in prayer. Then, as we have prepared the way for His entry into our own hearts we may be able to prepare others for the Divine Guest.

FERDINAND VALENTINE, O.P.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY

THERE have been many private revelations in the course of the Church's history. Some have been real, many more counterfeit; and even the real ones have been in many cases, as Benedict XIV said, "*magnis hallucinationibus refertae*". With these words of caution one introduces a new book, *Christ's Appeal for Love*,¹ to the sensible readers of THE CLERGY REVIEW. The book was first written in Spanish, and then translated into French. It has now been translated into English by Mother Keppel. The subject of the book is Josepha Menendez, a young Spanish girl, who after much difficulty from her family, such as is not unusual with girls who want to be nuns, became a religious of the Sacred Heart in the Mother House of the Congregation at Poitiers. There she lived a very holy but outwardly ordinary life, and died at the age of thirty-three. But all the time she was in constant communion with Our Lord, Our Lady, the Foundress of the Sacred Heart Congregation and other saints; they were appearing to her and she was actually conversing with them. The devil too was manifesting himself; traces of fire were even imprinted on her garments and her members.

The bulk of the book is taken up with the message which Our Lord delivered through her to the world, and with His talks with her on the various stages of His Passion. The message is reminiscent of St. Margaret Mary; it is the appeal of the Sacred Heart for love: "My appeal is for all—for the just, for sinners, for the wise and for the ignorant, for masters and learners. To all I say: If you want happiness, seek it in Me—if peace, I am Peace—I am Mercy and Love." That is the theme, developed at length over several years by many revelations. Indeed, so familiar was Our Lord with Josepha that the author of the book can say: "He constitutes Himself her Master and takes charge of her religious formation even in the minutest details. He instructs, He directs, He corrects, sustains and pardons her." At times Christ's visits were very frequent, at others rare.

It is all very wonderful. But the many struggling souls who receive no such manifest consolations from their Master may well wonder if it is true. In any case it is better to rely upon pure faith without visions, revelations and the like; and to guide souls, if one can, into that pure faith. "Blessed are they who have not seen and have believed." Private revelations, such as we have in this book, do not seem to be the mark of a strong, robust soul. Whether real or imagined, they are to the soul a quasi-corroboration of its faith. Do they not on that account spoil faith somewhat by giving it a support which the pure faith preached by St. John of the Cross has not got? Sister Josepha had apparently much to endure from Satan; her soul was, as it were, a battleground between him and Christ. No doubt she felt her trial very much. But good souls everywhere could endure any amount of temptation, if they felt themselves to be privileged as she was with the actual presence of Christ forewarning and consoling them.

¹ Sands & Co. Pp. 176. 5s.

Grey Eminence, by Aldous Huxley,¹ is a fascinating book. Written in Mr. Huxley's best manner, it studies the character of Fr. Joseph, the Capuchin Friar who played Maecenas to Richelieu. Fr. Joseph was a man of contrasts. He was a mystic, intensely mortified, very devoted to the Passion, in honour of which he founded and guided an order of Calvarian nuns. At the same time, as Richelieu's collaborator, he was immersed in what today we would call power politics, working with his master for the aggrandisement of France, even by means of the horrors of the Thirty Years' War. In this double role he spent his days in doubtful diplomacy and his nights in prayer. Fr. Joseph thought he could reconcile the two on the ground that the glory of France meant the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth. Mr. Huxley will admit no such reconciliation, and he considers that Fr. Joseph himself all the time, but especially when he came to die, saw the incompatibility of his position, and was really long aware that he had lost true communion with God in the worldly atmosphere of politics. Indeed, Mr. Huxley seems to think that no politician could be a mystic.

Mr. Huxley is widely read in the subject of mysticism. He explains lucidly the mystical teaching of Benet Canfield, which Fr. Joseph followed. But he is too hard on Bérulle and the French School as anti-mystical. Moreover (and this is naturally more serious), his general theory of mysticism will not hold. He considers that all mystical prayer, whether Christian or not, is one in its nature; it is an experiencing of the ultimate Reality which is the ground of all things and is, it seems, the God of Pantheism. For Mr. Huxley dogma and mystical prayer are in opposition; the Catholic system is alien to the true life of prayer. Hence he holds that the true contemplatives among Catholics were all in the tradition of pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, and they had adapted dogma to their own experience, with the result that, in so far as they were advanced mystics, they had ceased to be specifically Catholic. Bérulle was a mystic gone astray, precisely because his spirituality continually refers to and derives authority from the dogmas of the Church.

It would take too long to discuss in detail all the points Mr. Huxley raises. But there is a simple answer on behalf of Catholic dogma. The answer is that the greatest contemplatives from St. Augustine onwards have found dogma not a hindrance but a help to the life of prayer. St. John of the Cross is an interesting example. He was one of the most "spiritual" of the mystics; but he felt no incompatibility in having at the same time an intense devotion to the Blessed Sacrament.

The Life of the Very Reverend Mother Mary Philomena Juliana Morel, by a Servite Nun,² gives in a quite interesting and pleasing way the story of the first Prioress General of the Anglo-French Branch of the Servite Mantellate and her work in introducing her congregation into England. Mother Philomena was a soul of charming simplicity and very deep trust in God and Our Lady of Sorrows, even in the direst trials.

J. CARTMELL.

¹ Chatto & Windus. Pp. viii, 278. With 8 illustrations and an index. 15s.

² With a Foreword by the Apostolic Delegate. Sands & Co. Pp. 167. 5s.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

IGNORANCE OF NATURAL LAW IMPEDIMENT

Noldin, *Theologia Moralis*, III, n. 607, states: "Si impedimentum *indispensabile* est (e.g. ligaminis), matrimonium omitti debet, quidquid incommodi ex omissione sequatur, nisi adiuncta sint eiusmodi, ut impedimentum nupturientibus sine gravissimo incommodo tertii revelari non possit." How is the lawfulness of this to be explained, particularly the lawfulness of the priest's assistance? (H.)

REPLY

(i) It used to be discussed before the Code, and still is to some extent, whether ignorance exempted one from the incidence of an impediment *juris ecclesiastici* and whether the same ceased in grave necessity from *epikeia*. Canon 16, §1, has settled the point of ignorance as regards diriment impediments in favour of the law, and canons 1043-1045 have to a large extent provided for necessitous cases. Cf. Cappello, *De Sacramentis*, III, nn. 198, 199; Payen, *De Matrimonio*, nn. 566, 567.

(ii) When the impediment is of the natural law, as *ligamen* (the bond of a previous marriage), it is absolutely certain that it cannot be dispensed and that no kind of ignorance or necessity can ever make the marriage canonically valid. If a case occurs, as Noldin contemplates, the solution must be sought, not in canonical principles, but in theological ones which are applicable to the internal forum of conscience alone, and doubtful cases will be solved with the aid of probabilism. It is from this latter angle that Noldin is viewing the case. It means that a judgement is formed that the parties are to be left in good faith, if all the conditions for such are present, about the invalidity of their marriage; and when it is a question, indeed, of applying this principle to a putative marriage already contracted, there is no particular difficulty. It is the solution which Tennyson adopts for his hero in *Enoch Arden*, and is the common example cited by theological writers in explaining the principle of leaving people in good faith.

(iii) For the assisting priest in a similar case, when the marriage is not yet contracted, the difficulty is greater, because he is not ignorant of the invalidity of the marriage which is being attempted. If time permits he will have recourse to the Ordinary, but if this cannot be done there are sufficient reasons, we think, justifying his assistance. He may certainly do so when his knowledge has been obtained from the confessional, and the reasons which justify his action in this extreme case of necessity may also be invoked in other contingencies. For he is not himself administering an invalid sacrament but merely co-operating by his assistance: it is for this reason that a priest is not absolutely forbidden to assist at the marriages of public sinners as in canons 1065, 1066. In the case Noldin mentions the parties are not formal sinners, being excused by ignorance; they are persons requiring the priest's assistance as part of a legal form which, in their case, is absolutely invalid. If a priest may give this assistance to persons who are

public sinners, there seems no reason why he should not do so in favour of persons invalidly contracting marriage, provided that there are justifying causes of the gravest kind.

The point, raised by Noldin in his section on dispensing impediments, is usually discussed by the writers when explaining the causes which excuse one from revealing impediments. Cf. Cappello, *op. cit.*, n. 179; Gougnaud, *De Matrimonio*, p. 109; De Smet, *De Matrimonio*, n. 67; Payen, *De Matrimonio*, n. 480.

CONFITEOR IN DIVINE OFFICE

How should the *Confiteor* be recited when the office is being said with no priest or cleric in major orders as hebdomadarius? (F.)

REPLY

Breviary rubric "ad Completorium" in the "Ordinarium": si unus vel duo tantum recitent Officium, et in choro monialium, semel tantum ac simul cum omnibus ita fit Confessio. . . . The form given for united recitation omits "vobis (vos) fratres" and "tibi (te) pater" and has "nostri" for "ves- tri" in the *Misereatur*.

(i) The ruling twice given by S. R. C., nn. 512 and 1334, directed that nuns reciting the office in choir were never to substitute "mater . . . sorores" for "pater . . . fratres" but were to recite the text "prout iacet in breviario". This latter direction is now modified by the plain instruction of the rubric.

(ii) When the office is recited chorally by three or more male persons, there exist no explicit directions, as far as we can discover, on the correct method of saying the *Confiteor*. A note on the subject in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1934, p. 585, dealing with choral office recited by non-tonsured novices or scholastics, teaches that the alternative form for nuns should not be used in this case. We think that this is correct and that the same solution may be applied to all cases which are not covered by the above rubric: the text is to be recited "prout iacet in breviario", following the directions of S.R.C., nn. 512 and 1334.

MISSA CANTATA

Is a sung Mass without sacred ministers permitted if the priest has only one server? O'Connell, III, p. 208, in his description of the rite assumes that there are two servers. Is it obligatory for the priest's chant of the *Gloria* and *Ite Missa Est* to correspond with the plain-chant Mass sung by the choir? (W.)

REPLY

(i) The rubrics and official decisions about the sung Mass with no sacred ministers are meagre, and the rubricians are not always in agreement in

describing the rite. It is a celebration with some solemnity, and the writers, therefore, assume that at least two servers will be assisting; S.R.C., n. 3059, ad vii, is sometimes quoted for the toleration of two servers: “. . . quoad Missas Parochiales vel similes diebus solemnioribus, et quoad Missas quae celebrantur loco solemnitis atque cantatae, occasione realis atque usitatae celebritatis et solemnitis, tolerari posse duos Ministros Missae inservientes. . . .” Certainly the sung Mass can be brought within the terms of this direction, and it would follow, therefore, that one server suffices. Fr. O’Connell on p. 204 notes that the use of more than one server is permitted at a sung Mass, thus teaching by implication that more than one is not obligatory.

(ii) It preserves the unity of the chant if the celebrant intones the *Gloria* corresponding to the text sung by the choir, and the *Ite Missa Est* corresponding to the *Kyrie* of the same Mass; unity is required, in principle, from n. 11, a, of Pius X’s *Motu Proprio*: “*Kyrie Gloria Credo* etc. in Missa unitatem praeseferant sui cuiusque textus propriam. Non itaque licet ea partibus separatis componere . . .” But the text of the Vatican Gradual itself permits alternative chants for the celebrant which do not correspond with the rest of the Mass. Also, S.R.C., n. 3421, ad. i-iii, directs the *Gloria* and *Ite Missa Est* to be “in tono de B.V.M. quoties Praefatio de Nativitate Domini dicenda est”. Accordingly, there is no strict rule that the celebrant’s chant must correspond to the pieces sung by the choir.

E. J. M.

MATERIAL OF A CHALICE

Is it lawful to use a chalice made of German silver, the cup of which has been sprayed with silver and then fire-gilt? (X.)

REPLY

Ritus Celebr. Miss., I, 1: debet esse vel aureus vel argenteus, aut saltem habere cuppam argenteam intus inauratam et simul cum patena. . . .

De Defectibus, X, 1: si non adsit calix cum patena conveniens, cuius cuppa debet esse aurea vel argentea vel stannea, non aerea vel vitrea. . . .

Canon 1296, §3: Circa materiam et formam sacrae supellectilis, servantur praescripta liturgica, ecclesiastica traditio et, meliore quo fieri potest modo, etiam artis sacrae leges.

(i) Our purpose in answering this question is not to define what is fitting or becoming in the material of a chalice: for this there is only one rule—*quantum potes tantum aude*. We have to define what is the irreducible minimum, failing which the material of a chalice is gravely unlawful.

The stem and base may be of any metal but the cup itself must be of silver with the interior gilt. This is the clear rule of *Ritus Celebr. Miss.*, I, 1, which has been explicitly enforced in S.R.C., n. 3136, ad. IV. The text of *De Defectibus*, X, 1, nevertheless, permits the material to be of tin, a rule which is taken from *Decretum Gratiani*, C. XLV, dist. 1, De Consecratione: “Ut calix Domini cum patena, si non ex auro, omnino ex argento fiat. Si

quis pauper est, saltem vel stanneum calicem habeat". The concession of a tin chalice in favour of a poor priest must still be accepted as the common law, but the authors we have consulted all interpret the words in *De Defectibus* as being restricted to cases of real poverty, and they also commonly require even the tin chalice to be gilt within, as directed by the previous rubric. Cf. *Collationes Brugenses*, 1924, p. 421.

(ii) Local law frequently insists on the material being at least silver. Thus in *I Westm.* Dec. xviii, 1: "Calix et pyxis, si fieri potest, cuppam saltem habeant argenteam, intus inauratam". In our view, it is beyond all dispute that in this country it is not morally impossible for any priest to secure a chalice the cup of which is wholly of silver; whatever may have been the case when the Westminster decree was first framed, the clause "si fieri potest" is always and everywhere verified at the present time; therefore, a chalice cup made of a baser metal than real silver is unlawful. Occasionally, more modern diocesan legislation, as in Middlesbrough *Statuta* (1933), n. 221, makes the point quite clear by stating that all chalices sent for consecration must be accompanied by a statement that the cup is of silver.

(iii) Indults have often been granted, particularly for foreign missions, permitting the material of the chalice cup to be made "ex aere albo", "cuivre blanc", "Bronze d'aluminium". No doubt what we call "German silver" is the equivalent of one or other of these metal alloys. If it is desired to use the chalice above described for Mass an indult would have to be obtained from the Holy See. The local Ordinary could indeed dispense from the Westminster law, or declare that the exceptive clause "si fieri potest" is verified in the case; but the only alternative material in the common law is tin, not German silver or any other metal alloy.

E. J. M.

HONORARY CANONS

Must the number of honorary canons in any Cathedral Chapter be restricted in proportion to the number of titular canons? (G.)

REPLY

Canon 406, §1: Episcopo, non autem Vicario Generali, nec Vicario Capitulari, ius est canonicos ad honorem nominandi sive dioecesanos sive extra-dioecesanos cum consilio capituli cui canonicus est adscribendus, sed Episcopus raro et caute hoc iure utatur.

§3: Canonici ad honorem extra dioecesim in qua nominati sunt degentes, numero sint tertia parte minores canonicis titularibus.

(i) The decrees upon which this common law of the Code is based regard the honorary canon with grave suspicion and dislike: ". . . dum sacerdotes aetate ac omni virtutum genere venerandi amant nesciri et pro nihilo reputari, iuniores et qui parum adhuc aut nihil in Ecclesia bonum contulerunt, dignitates appetant . . ." "tanquam tirones gloriosi veteranorum insignia atque ornamenta virtutis praemia appetentes".¹ The complaint is chiefly

¹ *Fontes*, nn. 622 and 4265.

against the practice of priests obtaining honorary canonries in dioceses other than the one to which they belong, and §2 of the canon requires, therefore, under pain of nullity, that the consent of their proper Ordinary must first be obtained; in addition, the number of honorary externs must be restricted to two-thirds of the number of titular canons from §3.

This definite restriction does not apply to the number of honorary canons appointed by their proper Ordinary from amongst the clergy of the diocese; the law recognizes the Ordinary's right but directs it to be used rarely and with caution. Bouix, following the opinion of the older canonists, suggests that the number should be about one-fifth of the titular canons,¹ but we cannot find a post-code writer who discusses the question.

(ii) The First Westminster Provincial Council, held in 1852, altogether prohibited the appointment of honorary canons in the newly erected dioceses.² A modification of this rule was obtained from Propaganda, 7 July, 1904, which permitted titular canons desirous of resigning because of age or infirmity to be made honorary canons, and the number of such in each diocese was never to exceed three.³ We believe that the practice of limiting the honour to retiring titular canons continues still in many dioceses, and the number as given in the current Catholic Directory does not, for the most part, exceed three. It depends, no doubt, on the indults, customs and statutes of each body, as well as on the will of the Ordinary, and if in some instances the ruling of 7 July, 1904, is extended beyond the number of three, or honorary canons are appointed who are not retiring titular canons, it must be assumed that the practice is justified, since it is not at variance with the common law.

E. J. M.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

(i) SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

BRENTWOODEN. SEU S. ANDREAE ET EDIMBURGEN

BEATIFICATIONIS ET CANONIZATIONIS SERVAE DEI M. FRANCISCAE A QUINQUE PLAGIS, IN SAECULO MARGARITAE SINCLAIR, SORORIS PROFESSAE ORDINIS S. CLARAE. (A.A.S. xxxiv, 1942, p. 207.)

Super dubio: An signanda sit Commissio Introductionis Causae in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.

Beati pauperes spiritu, quoniam ipsorum est regnum caelorum, dicit Dominus. Spiritu autem sunt pauperes qui propter Dei amorem non superbiunt, divitias non inhiant, inopiam aequo animo perferunt. Hi caeleste regnum hac ratione salubriter magnoque emolumento sibi comparant.

¹ *De Capitulis* (1852), p. 156.

² *Decretum* XI, 11.

³ Cf. *Statuta Capitularia* (1907), p. 51; Middlesbrough *Statuta* (1933), n. 29.

"Pauperum perfecte renuntiantium, ita Duns Scotus, vere est regnum caelorum . . . Istud est margarita pretiosa, thesaurus in agro absconditus, pro quibus emendis omnia sunt vendenda" (*De perf. stat.*, n. 55).

Margarita Sinclair inops quidem erat, sed divitias non inhiavit, deliciis mundi, etiam licitis, renuntiavit, humilemque Christi sequelam his praetulit; sicque caelorum regnum sibi comparavit.

Die 29 Martii anno Domini 1900, Edimburgi, principe Scoticae dicionis urbe, ex Andrea Sinclair et Elisabetha Kelly, optimis coniugibus, tertia ex octo filiis, in lucem edita est, cui; eadem die, in sacro baptismo Margaritae Annae nomina fuere imposita. Divina gratia praeventa, adhuc puellula maturae pietatis supra aetatem specimina dedit, adeo ut a tribulibus iam tum sancta appellaretur. Decimum agens annum Confirmationis sacramento fuit roborata atque ad divinam mensam summo animi fervore accessit. Tanta autem erat eius erga Eucharisticum sacramentum religio, ut quam frequentius potuisset, ad Ecclesiam illud adoratum convolaret. Notatu quoque est dignum, quod palam, in protestantica civitate, supra pectus gerere non erubuerit tesseram: H. B. S. (Hand-maid of the Blessed Sacrament), h. e. Serva benedicti Sacramenti. Ut familiae necessitatibus levamen aliquod afferret—parentes enim erant pauperes opifices—quatuordecim annos nata, operam suam ad supellectilia expolienda locavit: ne autem quotidiana sacra communione privaretur, persaepe a ientaculo sumendo se abstinebat.

Pietate erga parentes, quorum vel nutibus illico oboediebat, amore erga fratres sororesque, quibus auxiliari opitulatique gestiebat, dilectione erga proximos, pauperes praesertim, in exemplum enituit.

Morum gravitate et modestia, eterodoxorum quoque animos in reverentiam sibi conciliavit, ita ut nemo ne verbum quidem minus honestum, ea praesente, auderet proferre.

Ex eius aspectu, ut deponit parochus, tranquillus serenisque animus, intima atque supernaturali pace fruens prodibat. Nec mirum: pax enim est tranquillitas ordinis; ordo autem exigit ut Deus super omnia et proximi propter Deum diligantur. "In spiritualibus, uti perbelle docet Duns Scotus, primum centrum realiter est Deus, et pondus suum est amor" (*Report.*, l. I, d. I, q. 4, n. 2): amor autem est sui diffusivum et qui recte amat, legem implet, ordinem servat et pace fruitur.

Deo ad religiosam vitam amplectendam vocanti obsequens, anno 1923 inter Clarissas, Londini tamquam aduitrix cooptari obtinuit. Biennio post, mense Februario, simplicia vota nuncupavit, Mariae Franciscae a Quinque Plagis assumpto nomine. Non diu in monasterio morata est. Gravi enim morbo implicita ad domum pro tuberculosi affectis curandis fuit translata, in qua caritatis, patientiae, humilitatis aliarumque virtutum insignia specimina praebuit; die autem 24 Novembris a. 1925, dulcissima Iesu, Mariae, Ioseph nomina invocans, purissimam animam exhalavit.

Sanctitatis fama crebrescente, in Edimburgensi Curia Ordinaria auctoritate super hac fama, scriptis atque oboedientia Urbanianis decretis de cultu Servis Dei non exhibendo, inquisitiones peractae sunt atque Urbem delatae.

Die 19 Maii anno 1938 ab hac Sacra Congregatione decretum super Famulae Dei scriptis prodivit. Nonnulla interim alia documenta collecta sunt, nec non plures Postulatoriae litterae ad Causae Introductionem a Summo Pontifice obtinendam: ex quibus duae a Cardinalibus conscriptae, decem ab Archiepiscopis, sexdecim ab Episcopis, a magnifico Glasguensis

Universitatis Rectore, a Scotorum Collegio de Urbe, a nonnullis Generalibus Ordinum seu Congregationum Moderatoribus seu Procuratoribus, a pluribus Superiorissis, aliisque.

Instante itaque Rm̃o P. Fortunato Scipioni, O. F. M., Causae Postulatore, in Ordinariis Sacrae huius Congregationis Comitibus die 3 mensis huius habitis Eñus ac Rm̃us Cardinalis Alexander Verde, Causae Ponens seu Relator, dubium proposuit: *An signanda sit Commissio Introductionis Causae in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur*, atque de ea retulit. Eñi ac Rm̃i Patres Cardinales, auditis relatione hac nec non Officialium Praelatorum suffragiis, audito quoque R. P. D. Salvatore Natucci Fidei Promotore generali, respondere censuerunt: *Signandam esse Commissionem Introductionis Causae, si Sanctissimo placuerit*.

Facta autem ab infrascripto Cardinali Praefecto relatione Beatissimo Patri, die 13 eiusdem mensis, Sanctitas Sua, rescriptum Eñorum Patrum raturum habens, *Commissionem Introductionis Causae Serva Dei Mariae Franciscae a Quinque Plagis* sua manu dignata est signare.

Datum Romae, die 13 Februarii a. D. 1942.

✠ C. Card. SALOTTI, Ep. Praenestinus, Praefectus.

A number of biographies of Margaret Sinclair already exist in English and in other languages: by Madame F. A. Forbes (Sands & Co.); Rev. T. J. Agius, S.J. (Sands & Co.); Rev. T. Doyle (*Glasgow Observer*); M. Favier (La Bonne Presse); Mgr. Laveille (Tequi). The sources printed in the above works have all been used in the life by May Rita O'Rourke (Burns Oates, 1929).

The stage now reached in the cause of her beatification is that of canon 2082. Since her death took place at the Marillac Sanatorium, Warley, Essex, the Ordinary of Brentwood on this title, and the Ordinary of Edinburgh on that of miracles, were competent to institute the informative process from canon 2039 §1.

(ii) SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

DECRETUM DE FUNCTIONIBUS PRO DEFUNCTIS (*A.A.S.*, xxxiv, 1942, p. 205.)

Quum plures locorum Ordinarii ab hac Sacra Rituum Congregatione exquisierint qualiter se gerere debeant quoad functiones funebres quae, praesertim hac tempestate, a defunctorum propinquis etiam diebus dominicis aut festis de praecepto celebrandae indiscriminatim petuntur; haec porro S. R. Congregatio eosdem vehementer hortatur, ut in huiusmodi functionibus peragendis curent ut omnino serventur praescriptiones quae tum in Rituali Romano (tit. VI, cap. I, n. 8 et cap. III, n. 18) cum in novis Missalis Rubricis (*Addit. et variat. in Rubr. Miss.*, tit. III, n. 4) continentur.

In exsequiis autem, si Missa celebretur, semper—nisi de pauperibus agatur—fiat in cantu, reprobata invalescente praxi eam legendi absque cantu etiam cum funus externam induit pompam. Quandocumque vero ex rationali causa funebris functio ritu breviori aut simpliciori agi contingat, ea

tamen gravitate ac pietate peragatur, quam non minus reverentia sacrorum quam populi aedificatio requirit.

Quod vero ad Missae funebris qualitatem spectat, Missa exsequialis ea dicitur, iuxta novas rubricas (*Addit. et variat.* l. c., n. 4), quae fit corpore defuncti physice aut saltem moraliter praesente. Corpus autem censetur praesens in altero ex immediate sequentibus duobus ab obitu diebus (S. R. C., decret. 3755, §2); non autem ultra biduum ab obitu (S. R. C., decret. 3767, ad XXVI). Quoties autem praefata Missa a rubricis impeditur, transferri potest in proximiorum diem similiter non impeditum (*Addit. et variat.*, l. c., n. 4). Si vero Missa impediatur non a rubricis, sed ab alia causa, tunc dicitur opportuniori die post acceptum mortis nuntium (*Addit. et variat.*, l. c., n. 6); sed haec Missa, etsi privilegiata, non est tamen exsequialis, ideoque diebus dominicis aut de praecepto prohibetur. Hoc igitur in casu dicatur Missa dominicalis aut festiva diei; poterit tamen fieri absolutio ad tumulum, exceptis iis diebus dominicis et festis in quibus Missa exsequialis etiam praesente cadavere prohibetur (*Addit. et variat.*, l. c., n. 4).

Hoc servandum praecipit S. R. Congregatio, sive agitur de militibus in locis dissitis bello peremptis, quorum mortis nuntius mature ad suos non pervenerit; sive agitur de definitiva alicuius corporis humatione, sive denique—eoque magis—de defunctorum anniversariis propriis vel fundatis, et de similibus casibus.

Datum Romae, die 1 Maii 1942.

✠ C. Card. SALOTTI, Ep. Praenestinus, Praefectus.

(iii) NUNTIUS RADIOPHONICUS

A Beatissimo Patre, Anno XXV Vertente ab initio Episcopatu, Die XIII Mensis Maii A. MDCCCCLXII, Orbi Universo Datus (A.A.S. xxxiv, 1942, p. 161).

. . . Oggi, quando la separazione di tanti fratelli dalla Sede di Pietro è venuta a così tragiche conseguenze con danno di tutta la cristianità e con scemata efficacia della loro azione nel mondo, laddove l'unione vitale fra Pastore e gregge nel mondo cattolico estende e mostra sempre più evidenti i suoi benefici effetti, si eleva anche con maggior veemenza dal cuore dei fedeli di Cristo verso il cielo la preghiera *ut unum sint*; alla qual preghiera si associano molti altri, pur vivendo fuori della Chiesa visibile, con sincerità e bramosia, perchè in un mondo avverso a Cristo stimano in pericolo fin l'esistenza del Cristianesimo. . . .

The above is the original of the extract given as n. 14 in the series of papal pronouncements printed in this REVIEW, 1942, xxii, p. 311. The English version of the whole address was given in the *Universe*, 15 May, 1942.

E. J. M.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Borgia Pope Alexander the Sixth. By Orestes Ferrara. Translated by F. J. Sheed. Demy 8vo. Pp. vi+455. (Sheed & Ward. 16s.)

EVERYBODY knows something about Pope Alexander VI. The something is usually a little vague, but the Borgia name has a sinister significance, and conjures up the suggestion of poison-cups, of daggers in the dark, of rich and restless sensuality, of incest and illegitimate children. Anti-Catholics tend to gloat over him, the more objective non-Catholics survey him with a mixture of compassion and condescension, while most Catholics, though insisting that he was never so black as he has been painted, have felt it best to agree that he was pretty bad—and what about it?

Now comes a book such as one would hardly do more than dream of writing—a remarkable vindication of the Pope from the mass of charges made against him, and an attempt to show him not only as a great temporal ruler but also as a zealous spiritual pastor, a worthy, nay an outstanding Pope, “the great precursor of the Council of Trent”. The author of this book is a Cuban lawyer and a non-Catholic, and if at times he seems too emphatic in his strictures on Alexander’s enemies, he has remarkably little difficulty in demolishing the lurid legends which have grown up round the pontiff’s name. He condemns with asperity the historian “who wishes to present, in good literary prose, facts not verified by himself but strongly to the taste of his readers”, and has wise words to say on the value of certain types of documentary evidence. It is well to know not only what a document says but also why it says it; and it is this which furnishes the clue to the problem of the growth of the Borgia legend.

Alexander offended so many interests in the course of his pontificate that propaganda was only too readily turned against him. He was, in the modern phrase, given a bad press, and he has never recovered from it. What were the interests which he offended? They were varied and far-flung. In the first place he was a Spaniard, an ardent Spaniard too, despite his long residence in Italy, and therefore despised as a barbarian by the Italians and hated particularly for the “cohorts of Catalans” he brought to the Vatican. The story of a simoniacal election, decided by one vote, and that his own, Señor Ferrara shows to be only too unlikely. He was elected, if not immediately on his merits, at least as a better choice than Ascanio Sforza and the triumph of a faction, or Giuliano della Rovere and subjection to the influence of France; and he seems to have been elected unanimously. But, being Pope, Alexander was determined to rule effectively as Papal monarch and not as the puppet of a noble house or the leader of a party. His policy was an offence to the great Roman houses, the Colonna, Orsini, Gaetani and the rest, who became his bitterest enemies. In a similar way his pursuit of Papal independence and zeal for reform offended other powers, Naples, Venice, Florence and the French royal house. All this was admirable ground for the seeds of slander which were soon to be scattered. They grew particularly in the pontificate of his successor, Julius II, who undid the best of his work, and have grown steadily—and uncritically—ever since, so that even the great Pastor, who Señor Ferrara suggests, was overborne by the fabricated stories of

Alexander's immoralities which he took to be proved, could do no more than say that defence of his memory was "unworthy tampering with truth". Yet the truth, as Señor Ferrara sees it, is exactly the reverse. For eleven years Alexander fought for the essential liberty of the Papacy and the Church—liberty from faction, and territorial independence. He had planned reforms within the Church, though years were to pass before Trent was to put them into action. Yet, as the author says, it "needed only a few days" for the cardinals to destroy what he had so laboriously built up; and in the ruin his own good name was swept away.

This is a closely argued and carefully documented book. Its conclusions, one feels, will stand examination and criticism. The legend, it is true, and all the associations of the Borgia name will die hard. But here at least is the answer to the unprejudiced enquirer, and it is an answer which carries conviction.

A. B.

A Detection of Aumbries. By Dom Gregory Dix, Monk of Nashdom Abbey. Pp. 72. (Dacre Press. 3s. 6d.)

FR. THURSTON, S.J., noted that, in the Christian literature of the first thousand years, there has not yet been found a clear and definite statement that any person visited a church in order to pray before the Body of Christ. It is even more remarkable, on the other hand, that the majority of communions as early as the third century must have been made by means of the reserved Holy Eucharist and quite apart from any celebration of the liturgy. These two statements might be considered as the background of Dom Gregory's book on the history of reservation. It is concerned, indeed, very largely with the different methods of reservation in use at various times, and some interesting illustrations accompany the text. But the learned author has given us much more than a description of liturgical usage, interesting though it is. With the sureness which is only found in a scholar of the first rank, he offers explanations of these customs, and in this respect he is a faithful disciple of Edmund Bishop, whom he greatly admires. It is sad to reflect that, but for the economies made necessary by the war, this book would probably have appeared in the dignified and splendid style of Bishop's *Liturgica Historica*. Even as it is, in neat and modest format, it is assured a lasting place in liturgical literature.

One point which stands out prominently in a mass of detail is the fact that devotion to the Holy Eucharist, that is to say *extra Missam*, had its initial impulse not from Rome but from northern Europe. "If we enquire in what church in Christendom we first find certain evidence of organized 'extra-liturgical devotions' (to use a question-begging phrase) in the sense of public acts and words of reverence addressed directly to our Lord in the reserved Sacrament, the answer quite certainly is: 'In Christ Church Cathedral at Canterbury about the year 1078 A.D.'"

Dom Gregory is in no sense a controversial writer, but it is impossible for him to avoid some reference in his closing pages to the differences of opinion in the Church of England on this subject of reservation. It appears that the Anglican bishops are all for aumbries and against the use of tabernacles or other methods of reservation on the altar. The author remarks,

with disarming simplicity and in the best tradition of monastic chronicling that it may well encourage them in their demand for aumbries to know that these were first ordered by the Lateran Council in 1215, in the canon defining transubstantiation, and that they have behind them the authority of the most holy lords Popes Innocent and Honorius. Actually it is not in the same chapter or canon that these two points occur: the word transubstantiation occurs in cap. i (its first use in an official ecclesiastical text) and the legislation requiring the Holy Eucharist to be kept under lock and key is in cap. 20.

E. J. M.

Catholic Social Guild Publications: A Primer of Moral Philosophy. By Rev. H. Keane, S.J. Pp. 116. (1s. 6d.)

Planning and the Community. By Michael P. Fogarty. Pp. 64. (1s.)

THE first of these publications seems to be a *verbatim* reprint of the previous editions, except that it does not contain Part III and Part IV covering special ethics. We welcomed the book when it first appeared in 1926, being the best thing of its kind obtainable at a modest price. Based largely though not exclusively, on the first volume of Cronin's *The Science of Ethics*, it provides a clear and very intelligible account of the nature of human actions, the moral criteria and the natural law, as expounded in Catholic schools. Though primarily compiled for Study Clubs of the Catholic Social Guild, it can be recommended very strongly to students for the priesthood engaged in studying moral philosophy or the principles of moral theology. The omission of Parts III and IV is, on the whole, a commendable abridgement, for it has always seemed to us that special ethics opens up a field too vast for inclusion in one manual. Moreover, the sociology of Part IV is already included in many of the excellent publications of the Catholic Social Guild.

One of the most recent of these is Mr. Fogarty's study of the bearing of Catholic social doctrine upon such problems as providing homes for the workers. The author is an Oxford economist who is in charge of the Local Surveys Department of Nuffield College Social Reconstruction Survey, and being also a member of the Guild is specially competent as a Catholic writer on this subject. A guarantee for stable employment means guiding industry to the places where it is most needed and helping labourers to leave areas, such as certain mining villages, whose industrial life is over; most of all it means attacking the problem of the trade cycle, which is the greatest single cause of unemployment. The Nuffield Survey welcomes the assistance of readers in examining actual local conditions, and is ready to suggest the lines upon which such enquiries should be made.

E. J. M.

Your Catholic Language—Latin with the Mass. By Mary Perkins. Pp. 224. (Sheed & Ward. 8s. 6d.)

THIS is something quite new in methods of teaching Latin. Whatever the merits of the old type of Latin Grammar, which introduced the student to his subject through an apparently meaningless maze of declensions and

conjugations, there must be many an adult who has been deterred from the study of Latin by his first meeting with these formidable lists of nouns and verbs. The schoolboy may have little choice in the matter; but the adult needs to be enticed. The author of this book strikes the right note of optimism and encouragement. Latin, she says in effect, is really an easy language; indeed you know quite a lot of it already through the many derivatives which you use in speaking English. Come, follow me through the Mass: "In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti." She is thus led to begin the study of Latin with a consideration of prepositions. But this brings her naturally to the meaning of declensions, and so, by easy stages (and with the text of the Mass literally translated on the opposite page throughout the book), the reader finds himself translating Latin into English almost before he is aware of it. We heartily recommend this book to those many priests who do invaluable work by teaching Latin to aspirants to the seminary. It will lighten their own task, and also that of their pupils.

G. D. S.

Untruisms. By the Rev. J. Heenan, D.D. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 1s. 6d.)

"UNTRUISMS" is an ugly word, but in the present instance an excellent one. The popular sayings for which it serves as a label are themselves unprepossessing, even at a mere glance, and upon examination their inherent ugliness becomes positively glaring. Fr. Heenan has taken some of these sayings to the microphone, holding them up to an enormous audience for close scrutiny. The numerous letters sent to him from all parts of the kingdom testify to the soundness of judgement that can be extracted from the ordinary listener when he can be made to think.

"Nothing matters anyway", "We'll all soon be dead", "I'm not interested in religion"; these are some of the vague formulae upon which many people base the conduct of their lives. Having in a few sentences demonstrated the falsity of these catchword phrases, Fr. Heenan proceeds to build upon the ground thus cleared as many sound ideas as the time at his disposal made possible. He is a master of the short and simple sentence, with the result that his broadcasts may be read with as much satisfaction as they were listened to. They show him to be truly a preacher of the Word.

L. T. H.

The History of the Primitive Church. By Jules Lebreton, S.J., and Jacques Zeiller. Translated from the French by Ernest C. Messenger, Ph.D. Volume I. Demy 8vo. Pp. 269. (Burns Oates. 16s.)

THE closing years of the nineteenth century saw the first attempts to write large-scale general histories on a co-operative basis, two notable achievements being Lavissee and Rambaud's *Histoire Générale* and Acton's great undertaking, the *Cambridge Modern History*. These were works in which different chapters were entrusted to recognised experts, and in which the scope of each writer was somewhat severely limited. The results were a certain amount of overlapping, a noticeable lack of unity, and some quite surprising gaps. The *Cambridge Modern History*, moreover, was unsatis-

factory because there were no references to authorities in the body of the book, and the bibliographies for the different chapters were often not the work of the authors, but were separate compilations. In the last twenty or thirty years, however, the conception of co-operative history has undergone some change. Great modern enterprises such as Cavaignac's *Histoire du Monde* or the *Histoire Générale*, edited by Gustav Glotz, are now arranged so that one or even two volumes are entrusted to a single specialist or to a pair of experts, with, on the whole, most happy results, both in regard to originality of conception and unity of treatment.

Catholic histories of the Church have been far behind these secular works, though Catholic scholars have had no small share in their authorship. The great French *Dictionnaires* of Apologetics, of Theology, of the Bible, of History, have shown that there is a wealth of scholarship among the French clergy, admirably suited to such a co-operative undertaking; and in 1935 M. Augustin Fliche and Mgr. Victor Martin launched an ambitious scheme to make good the deficiency. By the outbreak of the war six of the proposed twenty-four volumes had appeared and already Fliche and Martin's *Histoire de l'Eglise* had won a position of recognised merit. Dr. Messenger has been happily inspired to embark on an English translation of the first volume, which deals with the primitive Church, and was entrusted to two such acknowledged authorities as Père Lebreton and M. Zeiller. Their joint work won wide praise in the original edition, the volume realizing most happily the aim of the editors to produce a clear, concise, straightforward, but also up-to-date and scientific account of the present state of historical knowledge. The present volume, which represents about half of the original, is largely the work of Père Lebreton and is concerned principally with the Jewish world at the time of the Incarnation, the Life and teaching of Our Lord, and the work of the Apostles. M. Zeiller has contributed a sketch of the Roman world at the opening of the Christian era, and a most useful account of St. Peter and the beginnings of the Roman Church. It is refreshing to find so much space given to the life of Our Lord, for too many histories scamper through this, and leave the reader with the impression that the Church began at Pentecost and is in some way dissociated from the life of its Founder. Here we have a fine rich summary of the Gospel story such as one would expect from Père Lebreton, and an equally valuable account of the work of St. Paul. Apart from one or two quite minor lapses Dr. Messenger has achieved a remarkably fine translation, and in many points has almost assumed the role of editor for the benefit of English readers. This is a most welcome beginning, and we can only hope that the indefatigable translator will give us speedily the remainder of the great work. The whole should automatically take its place in any priest's library, and it should be emphasized that this volume in particular will be especially useful to teachers in the higher forms of secondary schools.

A. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

OUR PARISHIONERS IN THE FORCES

"Casados" writes:

More than once I have read statements that the Church in England missed its chance after the last War. I think there is more rhetoric than reasoning about that remark. But I do think we are missing a chance at this moment if we of the pastoral clergy do not try to maintain links between the parish and men and women in the Forces.

I say this with all diffidence, knowing something of my own shortcomings as parish priest.

A small committee from the parish has, without any difficulty, collected money which has enabled us to send postal orders three or four times a year to men and women in the Forces.

A letter has been sent along with the gift, signed by parish priest and curate, and the tone of the replies received from men all over the different fronts would astound the most hard-headed. Men really were grateful and some wrote most touching letters. I am sure it has brought some of them to Mass when on leave who had not been for a long time. Two or three times I have had letters written just before the writer was killed in action.

Here is a copy of one of our efforts:

Dear —,

If you are one of those who sent so many kind letters in response to the gifts we have sent twice this year, will you take this as a personal letter for yourself, please? We should like to write a special letter to each of you, but it is impossible.

When you write home next, will you ask your people to let us know at once of any change of address or of unit?

Conditions in the Army or Navy or Air Force on active service may make it impossible for you to get to the Sacraments or to hear Mass. Go when you can. Sometimes you will be able to go to Confession when you cannot go to Communion. You can always stick to your prayers, under any conditions.

We offer this advice with diffidence as from those who are not undergoing the discipline and rigours of your life. But we are sure you will understand our good intentions and make allowances for us. Do fight against the temptation, which *may* come your way, to believe that the war and your present life are a sphere where your religion cannot help, where you must struggle by yourself. God may seem far away on active service. Actually He is nearer to someone like yourself, who is at the least unselfishly trying to do his duty, than to those of us whose lives run on easier lines.

If there is anything you want in the way of a prayer book, rosary, Cardinal's Cross, etc., let us know. If there is anything which we can do here for you, we will try, whatever it is.

Here are some verses written by Sergeant Joyce Kilmer, an American Catholic who fell in the last war, which we hope you will like:

My shoulders ache beneath my pack,
 (Lie easier, Cross; upon his back!)
 I march with feet that burn and smart,
 (Tread, holy feet, upon my heart!)
 Men shout at me—who may not speak,
 (They scourged Thy back. They smote Thy cheek.)
 I may not lift my hand to clear
 My eyes of salty drops that sear.
 (Then shall my fickle soul forget,
 Thy agony of blood and sweat?)
 My rifle hand is stiff and numb.
 (From Thy bruised palms red rivers come.)
 Lord, Thou hast suffered more for me
 Than all the hosts of land and sea.
 Oh, let me render back again
 This millionth of Thy gift.

Amen.

God bless and keep you and bring you back soon,

Yours devotedly,
X.

CONSTANT'S REFORMATION IN ENGLAND, VOL. II
 (CLERGY REVIEW, 1942, xxii, p. 140)

Sheed and Ward, Ltd., write:

We should be very much obliged if you would kindly let your readers know that we shall be pleased to send to purchasers of the above book, so far as supplies will allow, an index which has now been made.

The courtesy of a stamp will be appreciated. (Not a stamped envelope.)

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

Messrs. Alex. Macdonald & Co., altar wine merchants, whose head offices are at Inverness, ask us to notify the Clergy that the new telephone number of their London agent is TEMPLE BAR 6227.

Will the Clergy in the London district and elsewhere be good enough to make a note of this?